A SYNOPSIS OF QUAKERISM: OR, A Collection of the Fundamental Errors of the QUAKERS:

Whereof these are a Taste, Viz.

1. That there are not Three Persons in the God-head.
2. That Christ did not make Satisfaction for the Sin of Man.
3. That Justification is not by Imputed Righteousness.
4. That our good Works are the Meritorious Cause of our Justification.
5. That a state of Freedom from sin is attainable in this life.
6. That there is a Light in every Man sufficient to guide him to Salvation.
7. That the Scripture is not the Word of God, nor a standing Rule of Faith and Life.
8. That there is no Resurrection of the Body.
9. That there's no need nor use of Ordinances, Baptisme, Lords Supper, *&c.*

Collected out of their Printed Books.

With a Brief Refutation of their most material Arguments, (and particularly, *W. Penn*, in his late *Sandy Foundation Shaken*;) and an Essay towards the Establishment of private Christians in the Truths opposed by those *Errors*.

The Second Edition, much Revised, and the Faults amended that escaped the first Impression. By *THO. DANSON*, sometime Minister of the Gospel at *Sandwich* in *Kent*.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1669.

1489, p. 25.

QUAKERS. DANSON (Thomas). A SYNOPSIS OF QUAKERISM : or A Collection of the Fundamental Errors of the Quakers . . . with a Brief refutation of their most material Arguments, (and particularly W. PENNS, IN HIS LATE SANDY FOUNDATION SHAKEN). The Second Edition, much revised. *London*, 1669. 8vo, Second Edition, old calf, rebacked.

Wing D 219. Rare. Only two copies recorded, none in America. Of the first edition Wing records the Haverford and Swarthmore copies in America.

30
58
OCT

TO THE READER.

READER, *The late daring Pamphlet of* W. Penn, *intituled,* The Sandy Foundation ſhaken, *wherin he hath attempted (but with too feeble an hand) to ſhake the Rock, Chriſt Jeſus in his Godhead and Offices, hath occaſioned this Undertakement. Seeing God had left him to himſelf ſo far, as openly to vilifie Three Grand Truths, I judg it not amiſs to take this opportunity to mind the world, how well he hath imitated the Leaders of his Party, in their reſpects to other like truths, that ſo the Chriſtians of theſe parts, may no longer be Impoſed upon by the* Quakers *ſeeming Innocence. The moſt refin'd civil Heathens were given over to the moſt fond and beaſtly* Errors, *about the Nature of God. It was obſerved of many of our* Engliſh Hereticks *in Q.* Eliſabeths *days, that they were charitable and devout; and you know many that look well in the face, have their inwards tainted and decayed. I preſume,* Reader, *thou haſt read over the Frontiſpiece of this Book, and then tell me what you think; do thoſe Principles ſound like* Chriſtian Doctrine? *do you not think your heart would give your tongue the lie, if (for fear of ſeeming rigid) you ſhould venture to ſay of the Teachers of thoſe* Doctrines, *Theſe are the Servants of the moſt high God, who ſhew unto us the way of Salvation,* Act. 16. 17. *Why then take heed how thou harkneſt unto them, unleſs thou art unconcerned in thy ſelf, and art indifferent whether ſalvation or damnation fall to thy ſhare. I am prevented in a ſerious Repreſentation of the danger of theſe* Errors, *by the pains of my*

Worthy Friend Mr. Tho. Vincent. *The mention of whose name puts me in mind of a Querie thou mayst make about my Answer to* Pen's *Arguments, why I do* actum agere? *The Answer is, I was ingaged in a Stile Conference with the said* Pen, *and he hath made some Reflections upon me in the same Piece, which are not to be wholly neglected: Again, experience hath shewn, that there is a great difference in Intellectual Gusts. The Method, Phrase, Notions of scarse any one man, are acceptable to all. And a President is at hand.* Biddle's 12 Arguments against the Holy Ghost's Deity, *were first answered by the learned* Estwick, *and then by the Learned* Pool, *and both to good purpose, and I hope not without success.*

And if any Quaker *shall demand, why I do not answer* Sam. Fishers *Book against me, instead of writing against a new man; I answer, that I am guided in my Neglect by the judgment of abler Persons than my self, that that Book is but a bundle of Impertinent Cavils, and none of my Arguments is shaken by his Batteries; and that to answer it, were but* Horas bonas malè collocare, *to spend time with* Domitian, *in catching of flies. I shall only leave two words of Advice with thee, and so we will part.* 1. *Be at some pains to understand the positive Grounds of the great Truths opposed by the* Quakers. *Remember that Wisdom is Silver and a Treasure; not onely for its excellencie, but also for the difficulty of attainment,* Prov. 2. 4. *It was the observation of* Min. Fel. Multi ob tædium investigandæ veritatis, divertunt in proximos errores, *i. e. Many men, through impatience of the pains they must be at,*

to find out the Truth, turn into the Errors next at hand. As a weary Traveller takes up his lodging, not at the beſt, but at the neareſt Inn. Be not thou a new Inſtance to confirm that unhappy Obſervation. For want of ſome pains, many Chriſtians are ſtrangely ignorant, and through ignorance uncertain, like Glaſſes, which may be blown into any ſhape you pleaſe; or Weather-cocks, that are indifferent to any point of the heavens. To leſſen thy pains ſomewhat, I have endeavoured to give thee the moſt material Arguments, by which thoſe Truths are ſupported, in as plain and familiar a way as I could, and as the Nature of the ſubjects would bear. Particularly, be at ſome pains to underſtand the right uſe of reaſon about theſe ſacred Myſteries, namely That it is not to judge of the Truth of the Propoſitions, contained in the Scripture, but of their Connexion: Take an inſtance, 1 Cor. 15. 13. If there be no Reſurrection from the Dead, then is Chriſt not riſen. *The Propoſitions, that the dead ſhall be raiſed, & that Chriſt is raiſed from the dead, are* de fide, *or matters of Faith: but the* Connexion, *or Conſequence of the Apoſtle, is evident to reaſon, as depending upon that maxim of Reaſon,* Sublato effectu tollitur cauſa; *Deny the effect, and deny the cauſe, if it be neceſſary, and not an accidental cauſe, as in this inſtance, if it be not day, 'tis not Sun-riſe.*

And therefore the Socinians, *who pretend, that we are not to believe any thing to be of Divine Revelation, which is not evident to our Reaſon, do diſcover but little of that reaſon which they would be thought to have ingroſſed to themſelves: For, does not Reaſon tell us, that*

the Nature and Works of God are above our reach? And that God were not God if he could be comprehended by a Creature; nor are the Creatures adæquate *effects of God their cause.*

And indeed their Principle takes away the difference between Divine Knowledg and Faith. Where is there any room for an assent to truth, propter authoritatem revelantis, *upon the credit of Gods word, if we are to believe nothing, but what antecedently to divine revelation, is evident to reason in its next causes, or proper Effects. Nor can I see what use Miracles can be of to a* Socinian; *the intendment of which is to inforce a belief of those Doctrines, which are inevident to Reason: It being a Principle which no man will contradict, that God will not put the Seal of his Immediate Power to a Falsehood.*

2. *Improve the knowledg which you have: I have often thought it a wise and sober speech of* Car. Pool, *that when one asked him how he should do to understand the former part of* Pauls *Epistle to the* Romans, *Replied, by practising the later,* [*the former part being Doctrinical and hard, the later Practical and plain*] In vitâ Car. Poli. *The neglect of such Advice, hath provoked God to give men over to strong Delusions, to believe lies groß figments, such as I have here presented thee with.* Reader, *I shall not detein thee any longer, but recommend thee and this small Piece to the blessing of God; by which if thou art preserved from being led away with the* Errours *of the wicked, and falling from thy own stedfastness, I have obtained my end, and shall therein rejoyce for ever.* Thy Servant in the Gospel,

London, Dec. 13. 1668. *Tho. Danson.*

A Synopſis of Quakeriſm.

I. Error.

That One God does not ſubſiſt in Three Perſons.

THree things I muſt neceſſarily premiſe, before I come to the proof of the Propoſition; which the Quakers deny.

1. I muſt neceſſarily explain the word *Perſon*, the uſual Definition is, *Rationalis naturæ individua Subſtantia*; or an individual Subſtance of a rational Nature, which *Aquinas* defends, *Sum. Par.* 1. *Q.* 29. *Art.* 2. but ſome think it lyable to ſome Exception, as whereby the humane Soul ſeparated from the Body, and the humane Nature of Chriſt, are made Perſons, and therefore add to it, *Quæ nec eſt pars alterius, nec ab alio Suſtentatur*, i. e. which is neither the part of an other, nor is upheld by an other. I ſhall not interpoſe my Judgment in the caſe, as remembring, that I write for the Unlearned

Unlearned, I ſhall chuſe to borrow that of the Learned *Wottan*, on *John* 1. *verſ.* 1, 2. *pag.* 29. which is the plaineſt, and will not be gain-ſaid I ſuppoſe by any Learned Man. *A Perſon is an individual Subſiſtence* [or *Subſiſtent* rather] *in an intellectual Nature*; or *a ſeveral or ſingular thing, that ſubſiſts by it ſelf, in a nature indued with Underſtanding.*

1. The thing which we call a Perſon, is by nature indued with Reaſon and Underſtanding. A man we call a Perſon, but we give not that name unto a *brute Beaſt* [An individual or ſingular Creature of that kind, is called in the Schools *Suppoſitum.*]

2. A Perſon notes ſome *one* indued with Reaſon and Underſtanding, which is ſeveral and diſtinct by himſelf from another. And hereby we exclude, 1. Qualities or Vertues, as Fortitude, Temperance, *&c.* from being Perſons, though found in a rational Nature, and diſtinct one from another, becauſe they ſubſiſt not by themſelves, but in a ſubject. For a Perſon is entire of it ſelf, and muſt not depend on any thing as a property thereof. And hereby we exclude, 2. The Soul ſeparated from the Body; for the Soul is a part of the humane Species, or of mans Nature, and *Retinet naturam unibilitatis* (as *Aquinas* ſpeaks, *Sum. p.* 1. *Q.* 29. *art.* 2.) is to be looked upon as a part ſtill in its Separation (the Separation of it from the Body being a violence offer'd to it) and therefore can no more be called

led a Perſon, than the hand or foot cut off the Body, [or then a part, the foot, for inſtance of a Beaſt can be call'd a *Suppoſitum.*]

2. That the word *perſon*, cannot properly be attributed to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, becauſe they do not ſubſiſt in a ſeveral and diſtinct Nature of the ſame kind: for if each of them had a ſeveral, and not one individual Nature, then they ſhould be not only Three Perſons, but Three Gods, which need not be a wonder, for as *Divines* ſay, *Deus & creaturæ nihil habent commune præter nomen.* God and the Creature have nothing common to them both, but names; which Rule muſt be underſtood, with the Limitation that other Rule ſuggeſts, *Nomina de Deo, & creaturis non univoce nec pure æquivoce, Sed analogice dicuntur ſecundum analogiam Creaturarum ad ipſum.* Aquinas, Sum. par. 1. Q. 29. Art. 3. That the names common to God and the Creatures, do not ſignifie ſimply the ſame thing, nor wholly different; but ſomething wherein the Creature bears ſome Analogy to God.

3. Yet may this word *perſon* be uſed by us (and tis uſed in the Scripture, of the Father, *Heb.* 1. 3,) to expreſs the diſtinction of Father, Son, and Spirit in the God-Head, and one from another. And the reaſon why it may be uſed, is this, becauſe *a perſon* ſignifies that which is moſt excellent and perfect in Nature; and what the Scripture hath revealed to us, concerning that diſtinction in the God-Head, cannot be appre-

hended

hended by us under any other Notion, or Reſemblance, which therefore we Attribute to God, yet after a moſt excellent manner.

For the Nature of Man being finite, may be multiplyed into many ſeveral Men or Perſons of the ſame kinde or Nature. But the *divine nature* being infinite, cannot poſſibly admit of a Multiplication. (For that there ſhould be two infinite Natures, implies a Contradiction.) Therefore when Father, Son, and Spirit are ſaid to be Three, and yet but one God, we know not what to call thoſe Three, but Perſons; for there is that aſcribed to them, (*viz.* Properties and Operations,) which cannot agree, but either to Three Gods, or Three Subſiſtents (that is, Perſons, though not ſtrictly, yet proportionably, or Analogically ſo called) in the God-Head.

And thus I think I have in effect anſwered all the Arguments of the *Antitrinitarians*, before I meddle with them. For their πρῶτον ψεῦδος, or grand Errour is, that becauſe the word *perſon* is not predicated of Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt, and of the Creature *univocè*; that is, the ſame word does not ſignifie wholly the ſame thing in God and the Creature.

Therefore they deny Perſonality of Son and Spirit: whereas, though the name *perſon* does not agree to them in the ſence of it's firſt Impoſition, yet it does, as to what we intend to ſignifie

ſie thereby, anſwerable to the Notion the Scripture hath impreſſed on our minds, *Vid. Aquin. Sum. Q. 29. Art. 3. p. 1.*

In the next place, I ſhall propoſe one Scripture, and from thence gather ſome Concluſions, the Proof whereof, will be all I ſhall offer, and as much as will be needful for private Chriſtians Confirmation in the Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

1 Joh. 5. 7. *For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One.*

The cauſal Conjunction *for*, implies a Reaſon of ſomewhat foregoing, (*viz.*) *That Jeſus Chriſt was the Son of God, Verſ.* 5. And ſo theſe words contain an Argument drawn from indubitable Teſtimonies. And from them we may deduce,

Prop. 1. That there is but *one* God, *one* in this Verſe is explained as meant of God, *verſ.* 9. *The Witneſs of God* is greater, referring to the Witneſs concerning Chriſt, *verſ.* 7. not to *verſ.* 8. for none of thoſe Witneſſes are God.

Prop. 2. That Father, Word, and Spirit, are Three Subſiſtents [or *perſons.*]

1. He attributes the Act of bearing Record to them; now all Witneſſes [properly ſo call'd] are Perſons.

2. That is not all, but the Apoſtle joyns *Word* and *Holy-Ghoſt*, with the Father, (whom all acknowledge a Perſon) as Witneſs of the ſame kind:

kind, so that if he be a Person, then are they also Persons.

3. I add, that the attributes of God the Father, for instance Omniscience, which cannot agree but to a Person, are also ascribed to the Word (or Son) and to the Spirit. *Jesus* knew all things, *Joh* 2.22. *Acts* 5.9. of which see the Fifth Proposition: I know that this proves their Deity too, but I produce it only to prove their Personality.

Prop. 3. That Father, Word, or Son, and Spirit, are Subsistants, or Persons of the same Order, *In Heaven*, as to the Father, notes the Seat of his Glory and Majesty (as appears by the use of that phrase in the *Lord's Prayer*) and why not then as to Word and Spirit? And some stamp of Divinity more than ordinary is intended, for otherwise there are many Witnesses and Persons in Heaven; the Angels, who from Heaven bore Record of Christ, *Luke* 2.10,13.

Prop. 4. That the Father, Word (or Son) and Spirit, are distinct one from another, appears from the Text, in Conjunction with the story to which they refer *Mat.* 3.17. where the Father and Spirit bear Record concerning the Son, as one distinct from them both. And *John* 8.18. the Word did bear Record of himself: And these did bear Record in a different manner: The Father by a Voice from Heaven; the Spirit by assuming the shape of a Dove; The Son by Word of Mouth on Earth. Put all together, here were

were Testimonies given from distinct places, Earth, Heaven; to distinct Senses, Ear, Eye; by distinct actions, speaking, assuming a shape. Then these Witnesses must needs be distinct.

Again, it appears, the Father, Son and Spirit, are distinct one from another.

1. From their Incommunicable Properties: The Father begets, and is not begotten; the Son is begotten, and does not beget, *Heb.* 1. *For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, vers. 5. The Apostle speaks of an Eternal Generation of the Son of God, declared and made manifest in time, by the Resurrection of Christ from the dead: see *Acts* 13.33. compared with *Rom.* 1.4. *John* 1. 18. Christ is called *the only begotten Son of God.* The Spirit proceeds from the Father, *John* 15.26. and Christ says, I will send from the Father; a mission implies a procession from both.

2 From their Order, which may be collected from those properties: The Father must needs be first in order of Original, (as in time also, a Father is among men) and the Son next, for *Relata sunt simul Natura*, The Father and Son are together in Nature: and then the Spirit proceeding from both, must needs in order be after both.

3. From their manner of Operation, one place will suffice; *But when the Comforter is come,*

whom

whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, &c. Joh. 16. That Miſſion was but a manifeſtation of the preſence of the Spirit, by a new effect, *viz.* a clearer Revelation of Chriſt, and the order is, the Son ſends from the Father, or the Father ſends by the Son, the Spirit, to teſtifie of Chriſt.

Prop. 5. To be proved is, that every one of theſe Three diſtinct Perſons, are truly God. *verſ.* 9. He calls the Witneſſe, given by Three in in Heaven, the Witneſſe of God; therefore each Witneſs is God, not to ſpeak of the names God given to them, which is more lyable to cavil (as being ſometimes given to Creatures.)

1. It appears by the properties of the God-Head, given to Son and Spirit (as for the Father, he is acknowledged to be God, on all hands.)

1. From their Omnipreſence, *Lo, I am with you always to the end of the World*, Math. 28. *ult.* ſpoken of Chriſt, *Pſal.* 139.7. *Whither ſhall I go from thy ſpirit? or whither ſhall I flee from thy preſence?*

2. Omniſcience, John 2. 24. *Jeſus knew all men*, Acts 5. 9. *Why have yee agreed together to Tempt the ſpirit of the Lord*, i.e. to try whither he could diſcover your Hypocriſie. There are other Inſtances of Divine properties, but let theſe ſuffice.

2. By the Works or Operations proper to God, as 1. Creation, *Eccleſ.* 12. 1. *Remember thy Creators*, ſo the Heb. בוראיך, *Heb.* 1. 2. By whom

whom alſo he made the World: 'Tis ſpoken of God the Father, with reference to Chriſt, and it implies, that the Son of God joyned with his Father in making the World, as an Efficient Cauſe equal in Power; not as an Inſtrument, for there can be none in Creation; becauſe, to make ſomething out of nothing, requires Infinite Power; and between a finite Power and nothing, there is no Proportion, *Job* 33.4. *The Spirit of God made me.* 2. Preſervation, *Heb.* 1. 3. *Upholding all things by the Word of his Power,* ſpoken of the Son (or Chriſt.) *Gen.* 1. 2. *And the Spirit of God* moved *upon the face of the Waters,* מרחפת *Commovens, incubans,* uſed of Birds brooding their Young, *Deut.* 32. 11. and ſo applied Metaphorically to the Spirits Operation in conſerving the *Chaos.*

3. That Son and Spirit are truly God, *Iſa.* 42. 8. by the Right they have to be Objects of Divine Worſhip: *And let all the Angels of God Worſhip him.* Spoken of the Son, who is called God, and ſaid to have a Throne or Seat of Majeſty; to the perſon whereon Worſhip is given, *Heb.* 1. 6, 8. and *Rev.* 1. Grace, Mercy, and Peace from him, which is, and is to come, and from the ſeven ſpirits, (*i. e.* the ſpirit that is manifeſted in Variety of Gifts) which are before the Throne, and from Jeſus Chriſt.

Though *John* ſpeaks in the Third Perſon, yet it is a *Prayer*, and ſo in effect, an Addreſs to the Perſons; as if he had ſaid, O Father, Son, and

ſpirit, Grant theſe Churches Grace, Mercy, and Peace. *Cant.* 4. *ult. Awake thou North Wind, and come thou South*, i.e. O Bleſſed ſpirit, breath into my heart; ſpirit compared to Wind, *John* 3. 8. the ſame Word ſignifies both רוח And to the ſon, *Acts* 7. 59. *Lord Jeſus receive my ſpirit.*

Prop. 6. That theſe Perſons are not divided one from another, ſo as to be Three Gods; but one God, appears from the Text, in that, he calls the Witneſs of Three, the Witneſs of one; *viz.* in nature or eſſence, which is *verſ.* 9. ſaid to be God, not Three Divine natures, but one is predicated of the Three Witneſſes.

And thus a way is made to an Anſwer to W. Ps. Arguments.

Arg. 1. *If there be Three diſtinct Perſons, then Three diſtinct Subſtances.*

Anſ. I deny the Conſequence; becauſe, as we ſhewed before, the Word Perſon is not prædicated of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and of the Creature *univoce*; that is, the ſame Word does not ſignifie wholly the ſame thing in God, and the Creature: But in God, Three Perſons notes a ſubſiſting of Three in one Individual Nature; in Man, a ſubſiſting of (Three) *Peter*, *James*, and *John*; ſuppoſe for inſtance, in Three divided, or ſeveral Natures of the ſame kind.

Arg. 2. *Either the Divine Perſons are Finite or Infinite,*

Infinite; if Infinite, then Three distinct Infinites, and so Three Gods.

Anſ. 1. We may deny the Disjunction, finiteneſs and infiniteneſs are not Perſonal, but Eſſential properties: For in the Notion of the Nature, thoſe properties are contained, before you conſider that Nature as in a Perſon. So finiteneſs in reſpect of man, and infiniteneſs in reſpect of God. And hence, though all the properties of the Divine Nature, whereof, infiniteneſs is one, agree to each Perſon ſubſiſting in that Nature, yet will it not follow, that there are *three* Infinites, but only one; becauſe there are not *three* Divine Natures, but only one, of which one Nature, Infiniteneſs is a property.

Anſ. 2. Suppoſe we grant that theſe *three* Perſons may be ſaid to be Infinite, tis no more in effect, than to ſay, that theſe *three Perſons* are God; we may as well attribute to the Perſon, the property included in the Divine Nature, as the Divine Nature, which includes the property (the Nature and Property being one, *re*, though not *ratione.*)

Anſ. 3. Yet will it not follow, that Father, Son, and Spirit, be *three* diſtinct Infinites, or which is all one, *three* diſtinct Gods (the property and Nature being really one, though different, according to our way of apprehenſion, as I ſaid above) becauſe thoſe *three* ſubſiſt not in *three* ſeveral, but in one Individual Nature.

Arg 3. *If each Person be God, and that God subsists in Three Persons; then in each Person are Three Persons, or Gods, and so from Three, they will increase to nine.*

Ans 1. If he understands the Terms; God, as we do (in the Antecedent) of God essentially, no such consequence will follow, no more than in this instance,

If *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, each Person be Man, and that Man subsists in those *three* Persons, then in each of those *three* Persons, are *three* Persons, or Men, and so from *three*, they will increase to nine. Take *Man* here, not for a Person, but the Nature as we do, *God*, in the Antecedent of *Penn* Hypothetical Syllogisme, and 'tis evident that we mean no more, then that the name *Man* may be attributed to *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, because the same humane Nature (I mean specifically) agrees to them, and so is the name *God* attributed to each Person, because the same Divine Nature subsists in each of them, (or rather, each of them subsists in the same (numerically) Divine Nature.) There is no Consequence in *Penn*, Argument, unless we hold, that each person in the God Head, subsists in *three* persons (which he goes about unworthily, to intimate.)

Ans. 2. I rather think he hath catched at somewhat in our Writers, which he did not well understand, which he would represent as our Judgments, (and thence deduce his absurd Consequence)

quence) (*viz.*) that Nature and Perſon in the God-Head, or God, are one thing. For the Nature of God is ſo ſimple, that it admits of no parts or Accidents. The *three* Perſons are not *three* parts, either eſſential or Integral of the God-Head; nor can the relative properties begetting, being begotten, proceeding, be accidents, but ſubſtantial attributes, as the abſolute properties, Wiſdom, Mercy, Juſtice (for inſtance:) yet will it not follow, that there are *three* Perſons in each Perſon, that is, that the Perſons includes each other, any more, then that theſe *three* abſolute Attributes, include each other.

For the Conception or Notion that we have of the Father (ſuppoſe) as a ſubſiſtent or Perſon, is *inadæquatus concentus*, in reſpect of the Divine Eſſence, conſidered as *affecta Subſiſtentia*, or ſubſiſting in divers manners, and ſo does not include the Son and ſpirit, who ſubſiſt in two different manners from him And as we cannot ſay, that the Notion of Juſtice does include Mercy, or the Notion of Mercy include Juſtice, though the Divine Eſſence, or God, be the ſame with both thoſe properties; ſo nor can we ſay, that the Notion of the Father, as one Perſon in the God-Head, includes the Son; nor the Notion of the Son, as one Perſon in the God-Head, includes the Father; though each of thoſe Perſons are the Divine Eſſence, or God [and ſo, nor does the Father nor Son include the Spirit, or the Spi-

rit include them by the like Reaſon] which we may thus illuſtrate, and indeed confirm, by comparing the Acts of thoſe abſolute Attributes, and the properties of thoſe relative Attributes. As puniſhing, is not an Act of Mercy; nor ſparing, an Act of Juſtice; nor does the one Act include the other: *So*, nor does the Attributes of Mercy and Juſtice include each other. So as begetting is not being begotten, nor being begotten is not begetting; ſo nor does the Notion of the Father include the Son, nor of the Son, include the Father.

4. The fourth is anſwered in the anſwer to the ſecond; and we do not affirm the Perſon in the God-Head, to be finite, but infinite.

5. If thoſe *three* diſtinct Perſons are one with the God-Head, then are they each one with another: That's the ſum, though he multiplies words.

Anſw. That Argument is grounded (though he does not expreſs, nor perhaps underſtand it) upon that rule, *Quæ conveniunt in uno tertio, conveniunt inter ſe.* Thoſe things which are one with ſome third thing, are one among themſelves. And I anſwer, That rule is to be underſtood, that they are one among themſelves, only in reſpect of that wherein they agree, not ſimply. As in this plain inſtance, *David* was a Man, and *Solomon* was a Man, they two agree in a third thing, *viz.* in the humane nature; Will it therefore follow, that they are one Perſon? nothing leſs. So

though

though the Father be God, and the Son God, it will not follow that they are one Perſon, for in perſonality, or manner of ſubſiſtence, they differ; but only it will follow, that they are one God, or one in that Divine nature, in which third theſe two meet.

And now I ſhall take notice of my Anſwer to his Queſtion, mentioned *p.* 10. of his *Sandy Foundation ſhaken*, and his reply thereto. Where firſt, the Reader is to know, that *W. P.* conceals his ignorance or falſhood in denying that *Perſon* was a Scripture term, and his front, in demanding an inſtance with that eagerneſs, as if none could be given, when I gave him that, *Heb.* 1. 3. Again, whereas he relates my Anſwer to his Queſtion, of whom Chriſt was the expreſs Image; that Chriſt was the expreſs image of Gods ſubſiſtence or manner of being, he does me wrong: for, my anſwer was, that Chriſt was the expreſs image of God, the Fathers Perſon. That which I ſpake of a ſubſiſtence or manner of being, was in anſwer to his queſtion: What a Perſon was. From whence he then infer'd, that if Chriſt was the image of his Fathers Perſon, he muſt be the image of a mode or manner of being; to which, he received this reply, that Chriſt was the image of the Father, ſubſiſting in the divine nature, not of the perſonality or manner of the Fathers being, nor yet of the divine nature in the abſtract, (which was illuſtrated by the Childs bearing the image of his Father.) And ſo my anſwer

to his two abſurd conſequences, will be needleſs. But if he thinks them deducible from this anſwer I gave him, I reply thus to them: To the firſt, *It makes God a Father onely by Subſiſtence*, that if he means, that the relation of a Father ariſes from a perſonal, not an eſſential act, I ſee no abſurdity, the emanent act called begetting, is not an act of God abſolutely, but relatively conſidered, that is, of the firſt Perſon ſubſiſting in that God-head. To the ſecond, *That Chriſt is then a Son without a ſubſtance*, I anſwer, that though the Son, as God, is from himſelf; yet as God the Son he is from the Father, the Perſon and ſubſtance being inſeparable. As for the place he refers me to, *Col.* 1. 15. *Who is the Image of the inviſible God*, I ſee not how it oppoſes my expoſition. God is taken there perſonally for the Father, not eſſentially for the God-head, or divine nature, which I prove: becauſe Chriſt is ſaid to be the Image of God; which if meant of God eſſentially, then Chriſt muſt be the Image of himſelf, which cannot be. And that Chriſt is God by nature, appears by *ver.* 16. where he is ſaid to be the firſt cauſe, and laſt end of all things. For the tranſlation, it is good enough, ὑπόστασις is uſed by the Greek Philoſophers for οὐσία, which *Ariſtotle* uſes for *ſubſtantia prima* and *ſecunda*, the former of which is, when the common nature expreſſed in the definition, is reſtrained by certain proprieties to an individual, which is called *Perſona*, or a Perſon, when the nature is indued with reaſon; *Suppoſitum*, when it

it is not. And ſo ὑπόστασις may be a Metalepſis; yea, muſt be rendered, Perſon or ſubſiſtent, or ſome word to that effect, becauſe Chriſt, as God, is of himſelf, and ſo is not the Image of any other, there being no multiplication of the divine nature, but Three Perſons in the Trinity.

Gid Amyrald. de myſt. Trin. p. 462, *&c.* And he that reads *Juſtin Martyr*, who flouriſhed about *A. D.* 150. will find that he applies ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον to the Father, Son, and Spirit, which anſwers *W. P*'s cavil, that 'tis ὑπόστασις not πρόσωπον, which is uſed *Heb.* 1. 3. and that the word ὑπόστασις was not uſed in that ſenſe, till *Athanaſius*'s time.

Error II.

The impoſſibility of God's pardoning ſinners, without plenary ſatisfaction, refuted So Pen *Title page.*

WHere I obſerve, that he argues againſt the impoſſibility of God's forgiveneſs of ſin without Satisfaction. Concerning which ſtating of the Queſtion, I ſhall ſay, that either he did, or ought to have known, that many of us who deny any forgiveneſs without ſatisfaction, do not affirm any impoſſibility of forgiveneſs without it. And for my own part though I know ſome worthy perſons do deny *W. P*'s affirmative, yet I cannot joyn with them therein. For to me it ſeems evident,

evident, that God is free in his determinations, what attribute he will manifeſt, and in what degree, and manner. Had Man ſtood, God had only manifeſted remunerative juſtice (as he does in the elect Angels:) when Man fell, God might only have manifeſted vindictive juſtice (as he does upon the reprobate Angels or Devils:) or ſparing mercy only (as he does in the Perſons of elect Men.) This variety gives ground to believe, that between theſe properties, or attributes of juſtice and mercy (not to ſpeak of others) and their effects, an act of his meer will intervenes. And neither of theſe is wronged by the manifeſtation of the other, and concealment of it ſelf. For the internal glory of none of the divine attributes, receives either addition or diminution by the external glory or manifeſtation of them, in their proper effects. And as for the way of redemption by Chriſt, we may well conclude it to be a free choice, by thoſe emphatical phraſes, whereby it is ſet forth, *The counſel of Gods own will*, Eph. 1. 11. *The myſtery of his will, his good pleaſure.* v. 9. He that deſires, may in my weak judgment receive much ſatisfaction in this point, by that ſhort, but ſcholaſtick Tract of the learned *Gilbert*, intituled *Vindiciæ Supremi Dei Dominii, &c.* In this we all agree, that God does not pardon ſin without ſatisfaction firſt made to his juſtice by Chriſt; and he that can make clear proof of this aſſertion, hath won the Goal from the *Socinians*, and their partakers. As for the poſſibility, or impoſſibility

of

of forgiveneſs without ſatisfaction, we need not much conteſt, ſeeing the cauſe does not depend upon either apprehenſion. It was a wiſe obſervation of *Aquinas*, *Cum quis ad probandam fidem Chriſtianam inducit rationes, quæ non ſunt cogentes, cedit in irriſionem infidelium; credunt enim quod hujuſmodi rationibus innitamur, & propter eas credimus, &c. Sum. par.* 1, *Q* 32. *art.* 1. & *Q.* 46. *art.* 2. I need not Engliſh the paſſage, for they who are concerned, underſtand the *School*-man without an Interpreter.

But becauſe *W. Pen* does alſo oppoſe the fact, and affirms that God pardons ſin, without ſatisfaction made by Chriſt to his juſtice, I ſhall therefore briefly explain the terms, and then give you my ſenſe in anſwer to four Queſtions. By *pardon of ſin*, we underſtand a gracious abſolution, or diſſolving of the obligation the ſinner is under, to ſuſtain puniſhment for his ſin. That abſolution which is not ſome way gracious, cannot be call'd a pardon. *Satisfaction* is not a Scripture phraſe, but the thing is found there. *viz.* a compenſation or recompence made to God for the injury done him by our ſin, which may be by doing, or ſuffering, or both: *Juſtice*, that is, *Vindictive*, God muſt be conſidered as a ſupream Rector or Judge, and not as *Pars Læſa*, the party offended only in the ſatisfaction made; and if any thing be *done* for ſatisfaction, (when the letter of the Law requires ſuffering or undergoing of a penalty therein expreſſed) it muſt in

ſome

ome reſpect or other have *rationem pœnæ*, (as ſuppoſe in regard of the perſon by whom) be penal, and in merit equivalent to what the Law required, and ſo eſteemed by the perſon, to whoſe acceptance it is tender'd. The Querys I ſhall anſwer to, are;

Qu. 1. What did Chriſt tender to God for Satisfaction?

Anſw. His obedience or ſubjection to the Law in its penalties or curſes. Therefore he is ſaid to be made a curſe for us, *Gal.* 3 13. And alſo to the Law in its precepts, whence he is ſaid to be made under the Law (*ipſo facto*, upon his being made of a Woman) to redeem them that were under the Law. *Gal.* 4. 4 5. which ſubjection to the precepts of the Law, was penal, as being a debaſement of ſo great a perſon; a ſtrange metamorphoſis, of an abſolute Soveraign into a ſubject. And therefore 'tis ſpoken of, as a wonderful inſtance of condeſcention, that he was not aſhamed to call us brethren. *Heb* 2 11. that is, fellow-ſubjects; for being one in nature with us, he becomes one with us in an obligation to the ſame Law. And (if it be weighed) the penal nature of what we call penalties or curſes, lies not barely in the ſmart of ſenſe, but in the brand of infamy, thereby ſet upon us, that we receive the due reward of our deeds (as the good thief gives us his ſentiment of his own and fellows caſe, *Luke* 23. 41.) And ſeeing that *Satisfaction* in the eye of the Law, is ſtrictly not *ſolutio ejuſdem*, but

tantidem.

tantidem; not of what the letter of the Law requires, but of ſomwhat equivalent; therefore it may be made, as well *agendo*, as *patiendo*; by doing, as by ſuffering. For ſome actions (as they may be circumſtantiated) may be truly penal to the agent, and ſo equivalent to the corporal puniſhment, which the letter of the Law exacts, and may be as proper for demonſtration of juſtice, maintaining the repute of the Law, and example to others.

2. *Qu.* What cauſality, in reſpect of God's act of forgiveneſs, Chriſt's obedience was capable of?

Anſw. Chriſt's obedience could ſatisfie God, but in *genere cauſæ moralis ſc. impulſivæ vel meritoriæ* as a meritorious cauſe; of which we ſay, that *movet aliquem ad talionem reddendam*, which moves another to recompence the act done, by good or ill offices; which we thus expreſs *popularly*, *One good turn requires another*. Which kind of cauſe works on an agent, and induces him to produce the effect. And that it is ſuch appears by comparing the cauſality of his obedience in reſpect of our impunity or freedome from puniſhment, with the cauſality of ſin, in reſpect of puniſhment; which in the latter induces God to puniſh, in the former, induces God to pardon. If it be ſaid, how can this be, ſeeing nothing without God can be ſaid to move him? for then ſomewhat in God ſhould be an effect of the Creature, and ſo the firſt cauſe ſhould have

ſome

ſome dependance upon the ſecond, which is abſurd and impoſſible.

I anſwer, There is no cauſe indeed of the will of God, *ex parte actus volendi*, as to the act it ſelf of his will: but there may be a cauſe, *ex parte volitorum*, as to the things will'd: whence the Schools ſay, *Deus vult hoc eſſe propter hoc, ſed non propter hoc vult hoc i. e.* God wills one thing for another; but why he Wills one thing for another, there's no cauſe to be aſſigned, but his Will. God wills the preaching of the Word, for the production of faith, as a means for its end: but why he wills that connexion between them, no reaſon can be given but his Will, for he can work faith without it. And ſo Chriſts obedience cannot properly work upon Gods will, but if it have the cauſality of an impulſive cauſe attributed to it, we muſt underſtand, that properly thoſe terms note but a connexion between means and end, Chriſt's Obedience; and the Sinners Pardon, which having been joyned together in God's Decree, cannot be put aſunder in the Execution.

Queſt. *How does it appear, that Chriſt's Obedience had the Efficacy of a Meritorious Cauſe of our Forgiveneſs?*

Anſw. 1. Thoſe places, which ſpeak of the turning away of Divine Wrath, by Chriſts Obedience; which Wrath, is but an Inclination to puniſh: He [Chriſt] is a Propitiator for our ſins, ἱλασμὸς, *Propitiatio*, 1 *Joh.* 2, 2. It notes the Act of

of Appeaſing, and the means whereby God is Appeaſed, *Rom.* 3. 24. ἱλαστήριον. *Propitiatorium, The Mercy Seat,* ſo rendered, *Heb.* 2. the true, as that was the Typical means of Attonement.

2. It appears by thoſe Scriptures, which ſpeak of Redemption or Freedom, from deſerved Puniſhment, purchaſed by a Price of Chriſt's Laying-down, 1 Pet. 18. 19. *Ye were not Redeemed with Corruptible things, as Silver, and Gold, but with the precious Blood of Chriſt.* Where the *Antitheſis* clearly imports, that Chriſt's blood is a True and Real Price, and of far greater Value than Silver, and Gold, which, *Yet anſwer all things, Eccleſ.* 10. 19. And it hath made a purchaſe of Freedom from Puniſhment; for that is included in *the Vain Converſation* ſpoken of, as an Effect in its Cauſe; and elſewhere it is ſpoken of, as a parcel of Chriſt's Purchaſe, *Gal.* 3. 13. *Chriſt hath Redeemed us from the Curſe of the Law.*

3. By thoſe Scriptures which ſpeak of a Subſtitution of Chriſt, for us, *Mat.* 20. 28. *The Son of Man came to give his Life a Ranſome for many.* λυτρον, *Res aut factum, quo movetur quiſpiam, ut aliquam Incommodò alioqui affecturus eo liberari Patiatur.* ἀντι πολλῶν. Which Prepoſition, when applied to Perſons, Imports the Succeſſion of one, into the room of another: ſo uſed Mat. 2. 22. and rendered *in the room* [of his Father] 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. ἀντι λυτρον. *Pretium Redemptionis*

demptionis, a counter price, ἀντὶ, In Compoſition, notes, either *Contrarietatem*, as in the Word, ἀντίχριστος, Antichriſt, *i. e.* one that oppoſeth Chriſt; or it notes, *Commutationem*, an exchange of one for another. λύτρον, Notes, ſome thing or Act, whereby any one is moved to let him go free, whom he hath advantage againſt. ἀντίλυτρον, Notes ſuch a kinde of λύτρον, or Compenſation, as in which, the Deliverer undergoes that Evil in kinde, or Equivalently, which, he that is delivered, ſhould have undergone. And if the Word imports an Exchange from one Life to another, then we conclude, a Satisfaction from the Nature of the thing. Either juſtly or unjuſtly we were to die; not the latter, for we had well deſerved Death, therefore the former. And if Chriſt hath freed us from that Death we were juſtly obnoxious to; what is that, but what we call Satisfaction in the Senſe of the Point in hand.

Queſt. 4. *Whence Chriſt's Obedience, had the Efficiency of a Meritorious Cauſe of our Forgiveneſs?*

1. It was a Perfect Obedience, 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult. He knew no ſin, (i. e.)* by experience of the working of it in himſelf, which *Peter* explains, when he ſays, *He did no ſin*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 22. Thence the Denomination giveth him,

An Holy thing in his Conception, *Luke* 1. 35. *An Holy Child*, Acts 4. 27. After his Birth, παῖς, and

נער and puer in the Three Learned Languages, ſignifie a Child (and ſometimes a Servant perhaps, becauſe the Child is born a Subject to the parent, *Jure divino Naturali*) *The Holy One of God* [in his Man-hood, even by the Devils, from whom, that Confeſſion was extorted by clear evidence] *Luk.* 4. 34. And *Holy, Harmleſs, Undefiled*, ſeparate from Sinners, *Heb.* 7. 26. ſince he left the Earth.

2. Becauſe Chriſt's Obedience was not originally due to God; if it had, one debt could not have paid another: I do not mean, that Chriſt as Man, was not ſubject to the Law of God, becauſe of the Union of the Humane Nature, from the firſt moment of it's exiſtence to the divine Nature, in the Perſon of the Son of God. For this ſeems contrary to Scripture, *Gal.* 4 4. *Made of a Woman, made under the Law*, and the perſonal Union ſeems no more to diſſolve the Obligation of Chriſt, as Man to the Law, then to take away the Eſſential Properties, Parts, or Faculties of Body and Soul (whereof his humane Nature did conſiſt.)

And if that Union did diſſolve the Obligation of Chriſt, as Man, to the Law; then Chriſt, as Man, could not be Holy by a true Inherent Righteouſneſs of the humane Nature, which lies in the Conformity to the Law of God, given thereunto, and ſo had not been capable of Meriting at all.

But in two reſpects, may Chriſt's obedience

be ſaid, not to be Originally due.

1. In that he being a Perſon, before he became Man, he was at his Election, whether he would become Man, or not; that is, a rational Creature, which, of courſe, or *ipſofacto*, (as we ſay) upon it's exiſtence, becomes a Subject, as the Connexion imports, *Made of a Woman, made under the Law*, Gal. 4. 4. and ſo had the refuſal of being under the Law: and he became Man, that he might come under the Law.

2. When he was Man, he was not under an Obligation, to obey to any ſuch ends, as to ſatisfie divine Juſtice, and merit Life, for them who had demerited Death. For it not being in the compaſs of any meer Mans power, there was no ſuch Obligation upon any meer Man; as to obey or ſuffer, by way of Satisfaction, for another mans Diſobedience; or to recover thereby the happineſs another man had loſt, and make a new purchaſe of what he had forfeited, and God had ſeized into his own hands.

3. The third Ground of the merit of Chriſts Obedience, is the Dignity of the Perſon: I know not what other reaſon, but the Dignity reſulting from the Divine Nature, to the Humane, that the Blood of the Son of man, is called the Blood of God, Act. 20. 28. *God purchaſed the Church with his own Blood.* The action of one Nature, is the action of the whole Perſon. [*Actiones ſunt Suppoſitorum*, we ſay in the Schools, and we diſtinguiſh, between *Principium quo*, and

[*quod*

quod.] A man is ſaid to think, and to ſpeak, becauſe they are both the acts of the Perſon, though the one he does by vertue of his Soul, the other of his Body. And as ſence is dignified by being under the command of Reaſon, in a man, which it is not under, in a Bruit, ſo is the Humane Nature by Union to the Divine. As for the Cavil of *Socinians*, (whoſe Vomit, the *Quakers* have now licked up) that the dignity of the Perſon comes not under Conſideration, becauſe 'tis not the God-head, or Divine Nature that ſuffers, it is very futilous. They might with as much reaſon, ſay 'tis all one, whether I ſtrike my Prince, or a private Perſon, or an Enemy, or my Father, becauſe my blows do not fall upon Authority, or Relation, but on the perſon in Dignity, or related to me (as *Grotius* well obſerves, *De Satisf. Chr. c.* 8.)

And it contradicts the common ſence of all Nations, who proportion their Puniſhment to the dignity of the Perſon injured. I ſhall anſwer one Objection, though not in *W. Pens* Book.

Object. *How can God be ſaid to forgive freely, when he requires Satisfaction? Are not theſe two Contradictory?*

Anſw. 1. There is no contradiction between Forgiveneſs, and Satisfaction, becauſe they are not *ad idem*, they reſpect not the ſame Perſons. If Satisfaction were required of us, we could not be ſaid to be forgiven.

Anſ. 2. There are divers acts of Grace, whereby God makes way for Satisfaction, and the benefits of it.

1. A Relaxation of the Law; which term in the Civil Law, notes an Act of a Superiour, whereby the Obligation of a Law, in force, is taken away, as to ſome Perſons and things. In the caſe before us there was ſuch an Act of Gods, whereby he admits a ſurety, whereas the Law threatned the Sinner himſelf. A relaxation of the Law, I ſay, there was, as that is oppoſed to an Abrogation, which is not here, for then the Elect, whilſt Sinners in ſtate, were not under the Curſe of the Law, which to affirm, were to contradict the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 13. and as a Relation is oppoſed to a favourable Interpretation, κατ' ἐπιείκειαν, for then the ſurety were in the primary Obligation, as when one Perſon enters into a Recogniſance with another, for his appearance in Court. But Chriſt was not bound with Man in the Covenant of works, to ſee the law kept, or undergo the penalty which Relaxation was an Act of Soveraignty: to the exerciſe whereof, his own grace and nothing foreſeen in us did prompt him.

2. Another Act of Gods Grace, is the Nomination and Appointment of a ſurety; Chriſt was made a *ſurety*, *Heb.* 7. 21. and by the Father, *Heb.* 10. 7. I come to do thy will, ſays Chriſt to his Father, of his undertakement as our ſurety; which is an Act of Grace, for the Debtor, not the Creditor; the Malefactour, not the Judge,

is to find a ſurety. A Repreſentation of both theſe Acts we have, *Gen.* 22. 2. 13. where God admitted, and provided a *Ram* for a Sacrifice, inſtead of *Iſaac*; though the Letter of the Command was to offer *Iſaac* himſelf.

3. Gods Actual Acceptance, the Payment or Satisfaction, made and tendered by Chriſt, which appears as otherwiſe, ſo eſpecially.

1. By his Reſurrection, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. God manifeſt in the Fleſh, was juſtified in the Spirit; that is, by his God-head [ſo called, becauſe 'tis in Nature Spiritual, 1 *Joh.* 4. 24.] compared with 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. where 'tis ſaid of Chriſt, *That he was put to death in the Fleſh, but quickned by the Spirit*; that is, his Humane and Divine Nature. And they inſtruct us in this Truth, that Chriſt's Reſurrection, was not only an Effect of Divine Power, but alſo of Chriſts Juſtification from our ſin, charged upon him in his Death; and ſo a Foundation laid for our Actual Forgiveneſs, to be built on by Faith.

That paſſage alſo contributes ſome Aſſiſtance, *Matt.* 28. *verſ.* 3. where the Angels of the Lord deſcended from Heaven, *and rold away the Stone from the Door of the Sepulchre*, which would have been an Impediment to his getting out. For what can the Creditors releaſe of the Surety out of Priſon ſignifie, but that he is ſatisfied, and the Debt paid?

2. By his Interceſſion; which being grounded upon his Satisfaction, ſuppoſes it to be what it

pretends, full and compleat; and being an Application to Grace, ſuppoſes that ſatisfaction to be *Solutio recuſabilis*, refuſable payment; for in Obligations which ariſe *ex delicto*, from an Offence committed, *Dum alius ſolvit, aliud ſolvitur*, (as *Grotius* ſpeaks, *De Satis Chr. c.* 7. when another Perſon [then what was originally obliged] makes payment [of the Debt of puniſhment, due to Juſtice] another thing is paid [them what the Law required,] As ſuppoſe, for one man to offer to die for another, is no more in the Eye of the Law, than to offer himſelf to be Whipped, to ſave the others Life; For the Judge can no more admit of Exchange of Perſon, than of Penalty.

4. Another act of Grace is in the means of Application, of that Satisfaction he exacts of Chriſt; I mean Faith in Chriſt: the formal Act whereof, as Juſtifying ſeems beſt placed in an Acceptance of Chriſt, for Juſtification, that being the correlate of the offer of Chriſt for that end in the Goſpel. Here appears a double act of Grace. 1. In the choice of this Means of Application, an acceptance looking leaſt like a Meritorious Act. 2. In the beſtowing of it, Faith being the gift of God. The Apoſtle ſuggeſts both, when he ſays, *We are ſaved by Grace, through that Faith, which is not of our ſelves*, Eph. 2. 8.

W. Pens Scriptures, from *p.* 16. to 20. proves only what we grant, (*viz.*) *That God does freely pardon Sin; but, not that he pardons Sin without*

Satisfaction; only we may obſerve, how in the Enumeration of thoſe Names of God which import free Forgiveneſs, he leaves out that Name (which is ſub-joyned to them as a Limitation.) *That will by no means clear the Guilty*, Exod. 34.7. That is not contrary to the order of Juſtice, which he hath preſcribed, which order, is to require that Satisfaction of the ſurety, which is remitted to the Principal. From *Mat.*6.12. *Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors*, he ſeems to offer at an Argument.

Arg. If it be our duty to forgive without a Satisfaction received, and God is to forgive us, *as we forgive them*, then is a Satisfaction totally excluded, *p.* 18.

Anſ. There is an agreement between Gods Forgiveneſs and ours. 1. In reſpect of the *cauſa Proegumena*, or inward moving Cauſe, called *Kindneſs*, *Tender-Heartedneſs*, Eph. 4. 32. 2. In reſpect of the Effect, which in both, is the Offenders Impurity.

But it will not follow there muſt be a ſimilitude every way. *Pen* might, with as much ſhew of Reaſon, infer from *Eph.* 4.32. *Forgiving one another, even as God for Chriſts ſake hath forgiven you*; that ſeeing we are to forgive, as God does us, therefore we are not to forgive another, but for the ſake of ſome Third Perſon, who hath intereſt in us.

Anſ. 2. We are not bound in all caſes, to forgive another without Satisfaction. *If he repent, forgive him*; *if he turn again to thee, ſaying*

repent, thou ſhalt forgive him, Luke 17. 3, 4. Man as a Judge, may not forgive without Satisfaction to Law.

Arg. From *Matt.* 18. 27, 33. he infers, that it had been no fault in the Servant, not to have forgiven his Brother without Satisfaction, if the Kings Mercy had not been propoſed for his Example.

Anſw. 1. That wherein the Compariſon lies, is the Forgiveneſs it ſelf; not the manner of Forgiveneſs: There is ground enough for a Compariſon, between Perſons, or things, if there be a likeneſs in any one reſpect: See *verſ.* 35.

2. If we ſtick in the Letter of the Parable, God is repreſented under another *σχέσις*, habitude or Conſideration than in the Doctrine of Satisfaction now under debate. For, here he is conſidered as Rector, or Governour; but there as a Creditor, and ſo as a private Perſon. In the Doctrine of Satisfaction, God diſcharges from Obligations, *Ex delicto,* or debts due to Juſtice, by Offence committed againſt the Law.

In the Parable, God diſcharges from an Obligation, *Ex contractu,* ariſing from Covenant or Contract: So is a man made a debtour to a private Perſon. And there's not the ſame reaſon in many reſpects, for Forgiveneſs without Satisfaction in both caſes; not to Execute Penal Laws, is to diſparage the Legiſlative Authority. Hence the Rule in Politicks, *τὰς κειμένας ἰσχυρὰς διαφυλάττειν.* not eaſily to relax Laws once Eſtabliſhed. His

His first Absurdity, *p.* 20. I pass by, having declared my sense about the possibility of pardoning sin without Satisfaction.

Abs. 2. *That the Creature is more capable of extending Forgiveness, than the Creator.*

Ans. All that will follow from our Doctrine, is, that there is great difference between Gods condition and ours, his Majesty and our meanness, that we have no reason to stand so much upon our Terms, and to have such a Sentiment of affronts done to us, there being an equality between us and our Brethren, but an Infinite inequality between God and us.

Abs. 3. *That God so Loved the World, as to give his only Son for to save it, and yet, that God stood off in Displeasure, till Christ satisfied his Justice,* pag. 20.

Ans. To clear this, observe that Divines distinguish of *Tria momenta Divinæ voluntatis*, three steps or degrees of Divine Love to Mankind. 1. Before Christs Satisfaction, God is not wholly averse from Reconciliation on good Terms, (though he be throughly angry with us.) For if he had been resolved to stand to the Rigor of the Law, and not admit of any Satisfaction, there had been an end of our Salvation.

2. Upon Christs Satisfaction, he does not only determine, but promise to lay his Anger aside.

3. Upon Actual Faith, he lays aside his Anger quite, and becomes our Friend.

W. Penn Reaſons why Chriſt could not ſatisfie Gods Juſtice, as man, or as God ſingly, I paſs by, though I might except againſt ſome of them as not *cogent*, though the thing be true, and owned by us.

But his reaſon; why Chriſt could not ſatisfie as God-man, is abſurd in phraſe and ſenſe. For, where two Mediums, or middle Propoſitions are ſingly inconſiſtent, with the Nature of the end, for which they were at firſt propounded, their Conjunction does rather Augment than leſſen the difficulty of its accompliſhment.

His meaning is, I think, that where two things ſingly will not attain any end, for which they are uſed as means, much leſs will they attain it together: As if he ſhould ſay, two men can much leſs bear a Burden, when joyned together, which neither of them alone can bear; or rather, as if he ſhould ſay, *Lazarus* Soul without his Body could not ſpeak, nor his Body without the Soul in their Separation; therefore in their Union or Conjunction, at his Reſurrection, much leſs could he ſpeak. I refer you to what hath been ſaid before of the value of Chriſts Obedience, ariſing from the Dignity of his Perſon.

To his Conſequences Irreligious and Irrational, I ſhall ſay a little. In the two firſt, I am not concerned, becauſe they militate againſt the Impoſſibility of Forgiveneſs without Satisfaction, which I do not affirm.

Conſ. 3. *That it was unworthy of God to pardon,*

but

but not to inflict punishment on the Innocent, or require a Satisfaction where there was Nothing due.

Answ. 1. I do not say (nor do we generally) that is was unworthy of God, to pardon Sin without Satisfaction, because he did not think fit to do it. That will be no better Consequence, than to say, if it had pleased God to Create the World. *Then it had been unworthy of God, not to have Created it.*

For God proceeded on good Grounds, in resolving the *contrary*.

1. For though his Love to Righteousness, and Hatred of Sin, had been never the less; if he had not punished Sin, yet man might have been apt to have mis-judged him. The sinner concluded God to be such an one as himself, (*i.e.* one that made as light a matter of sin as he did) because of Gods patience towards him, *Psal.* 50. 21.

2. Impunity might have been abused for an Incouragement to sin, *Eccles.* 8. 11. and other reasons might be given.

3. The reason; why it was not unworthy of God to punish the Innocent, is, because of his free consent, and *Volenti non fit injuria*; and because as God he had a Soveraign, and as man, a special deputed Power over his life, and the comforts of it, *John* 10. 18. He had a *commandment* to lay down his Life.

3. According to *Pen's* Opinion; Christ, though Innocent, and but a meer-Man, Suffered only

for

for an Example, *p.* 19. and why not then for Satisfaction to Divine Justice, that being a Nobler design?

4. Christ, when he suffered, was not Innocent, and when God required Satisfaction of him, it was due from him. Christ was guilty of our sin, when he suffered for it. For Guilt is but *Obligatio ad Pœnam*, an Obligation to undergo Punishment, which Christ was under by Contract; Christ was a *surety*, *Heb.* 7. 22. when our debt was demanded of him. And the *surety* is as truly a Debtor as the Principal, though the manner of becoming such be different.

Conf. 4. It deprives God of the Praise of his Love.

Conf 6. It Robs God of the Gift of his Son for our Redemption.

Conf. 8. Then we are not beholding to God.

Answ. I put these together, because he here contradicts himself; for if the Son was Gods Gift for our Redemption, how are we not beholden to God? or how is God deprived entirely of the praise of his Grace in our Redemption?

Conf. 5. It represents the Son more kind than the Father; whereas, if he be same God, then either the Father is as loving as the Son, or the Son as angry as the Father.

Anſ. 1. Consider, the Father and Son as God, they are equally kind to Mankind, and equally angry at mans sin, as appears by their purposes

of

of Mercy, and Puniſhment, diſcovered in the Promiſes and Threatnings.

2. Our Doctrine repreſents not the Son kinder than the Father, but intimates a diſtinct manner and order of Kindneſs or Operation, about our Salvation, anſwerable to the order of their being; that as the Father is the firſt, ſo the Contrivement of our Redemption, is more peculiarly his Act, the Undertakement of our actual Redemption, peculiarly the Act of the Son. It is a rule in Divinity, *Unum idemq; opus* [or *operatio vel actio* rather *Opus enim eſt effectus actionis*] *ad extra diverſo reſpectu Perſonale eſt, & eſſentiale.* External Actions of God are in a divers reſpect, Eſſential and Perſonal. The Decree of the Son of Gods Incarnation, the Creation of his Body and Soul, the parts of that Nature he ſubſiſted in, were Acts common to Father and Son as one God, or Eſſential Acts; but the Election of the Son to be our Redeemer in our Nature, is the peculiar Act of the Father; The aſſumption of our Nature, the peculiar Act of the Son, or perſonal Act.

Conſ. 6. It Robs God of the Gift of his Son for our Redemption, in affirming, the Son purchaſed that Redemption from the Father, by giving himſelf to God as our Compleat Satisfaction.

Anſ. No ſuch matter. The deſignation of the Son of God to be our Redeemer, conſidered, as the Fathers perſonal act is a fruit of the meer

love

love of God the Father: yet the actual collation of Redemption in its effects and benefits depends on Christs purchase: or as the Schools distinguish, the *actus volendi*, or the Fathers gift of the Son for our Redemption (to use *Pen's* phrase) depends on nothing without himself: but the *res volita*, or the Redemption it self, our actual freedom from sin and wrath depends on what Christ did and suffer'd, as an end upon its means.

Conf. 7. By Christs payment of our debt it is not forgiven, but transferd, we owing that now to the Son, which was owing before to the Father.

Anſ. He might as well say, when a surety pays the debt, the debtor owes that to the surety, he owed before to his Creditor, and so he is no better provided for than before, (to use *W. Pen's* words) which is not true, but when counter-security is given the surety by the principal.

Conf. 9. If Gods justice be satisfied for sins past, present, and to come, God and Christ have lost their power of injoyning godliness, and punishing disobedience.

Anſ. 1. Christs obedience was not intended to exempt us from a personal obedience to the Law, but from it only as a condition of life. And we are only so far made righteous by Christs obedience, as we are unrighteous by our own disobedience.

2. God cannot punish disobedience by vertue of the Covenant of works upon a justified person,

ſon, for then he ſhould exact ſatisfaction of the Debter, after he had received it of the ſurety. And why may we not ſay, God cannot do, what were unjuſt for him to do? A moral, though not a natural impotency may be aſcribed to God.

Errour 3.

That we are not juſtified by imputed righteouſneſs, W. Pen.

THe word *juſtifie* δικαιόω and δικαίωμαι, and the *Heb.* הצדיק ſignifies *juſtum facere*, and in the Scripture uſage, it is a forenſick word, and ſignifies to pronounce righteous, and ſo is oppoſed to condemnation and accuſation, *Rom.* 8. 33. The word impute λογίζομαι properly ſignifies the ſame with ψηφίζω *ſupputo*, to caſt account, and the *Heb.* חשב ſignifies to think, imagine, and reaſon, and hence in Scripture it is applied to a legal Act, whereby the righteouſneſs of one, *viz.* Chriſt is admitted for another, and ſo far accounted and eſteemed that others, as that he obtains the benefit of it, to all intents and purpoſes, as if it had been his perſonal righteouſneſs. I ſhall produce for the word and thing but one Scripture, which is expreſs for us, Rom. 4. 6. *As David deſcribes the bleſſedneſs of the Man, to whom the Lord imputeth Righteouſneſs without Works*, that is the Righteouſneſs of another, without Works of his own, elſe there were *con-*

tradictio

traditio in adjecto.] And obſerve, the Apoſtle gives us the ſum of *Davids* Words, *verſ.* 7. 8. which ſpeak not of Imputation of Righteouſneſs in terms, but of Forgiveneſs, and not imputing Sin, which muſt be ſuppoſed to lie in Imputation of Righteouſneſs, as Effects in their Cauſe. Now in abſolutely free Forgiveneſs, there's no Imputation of Righteouſneſs, but what is our own inherently, according to *Pen.* and other *Socinians.*

Three Arguments will ſuffice to evince the Truth on our ſide.

Arg. 1. From the proportion which our Juſtification by Chriſts Righteouſneſs bears to our Condemnation by *Adam's* Sin, but our Condemnation was by Imputation of *Adams* Sin. Therefore our Juſtification is by the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 5. 19. points us out to this Collation; *As by one mans Diſobedience, many were made Sinners: ſo by the Obedience of one, ſhall many be made Righteous.*

Arg. 2. From the proportion, which our being made Righteous, bears to Chriſts, being made Sin. But Chriſt was made Sin by Imputation. Therefore ſo are we *made Righteous*, 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult*, gives ground for Arguing from ſuch Proportion; *For he was made Sin for us, who knew no Sin,* [*i. e.* by an Experimental knowledge of its Operation in himſelf, *Peter* therefore ſays, *he did no Sin*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21.] that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him.

Arg.

Arg. 3. From the proportion, which Imputation of Righteouſneſs to us, bear to the matter of our Juſtification, which (as we have ſhewn before) being the Righteouſneſs of another, cannot be made ours any other way, than by Imputation. So, and no otherwiſe, the *ſureties* payment of the Debt becomes the Act of the principal Debtor.

This laſt Argument ſuggeſts an Anſwer to *W. P*'s Cavils about the word *Impute*, that it is altogether uſed to expreſs what is perſonally theirs, of whom it is ſpoken, *p.* 29. For ſuppoſing it were ſo ordinarily, yet when it is applyed to the act of one perſon, by Operation of Law made another, it cannot be ſo meant. For it is a good rule, *Verba intelliguntur ſecundum Subjectam materiam*, words are to be interpreted, when ambiguous, according to their ſubject matter. I ſhall propoſe, and anſwer one Objection of another *Quakers*, before I come to *Pen's*.

Obj. How can God account us to have done what we have not? So *Whitehead*, *Voice of Wiſdome*. 3. Head.

Sol. We muſt not fancy any miſapprehenſion or falſe judgement in God: God does not (to ſpeak ſtrictly) account us to have done and ſuffered what we did not, as the Creditor does not account the principal to have paid the debt, which he knows the *ſurety* paid for him. But God admits of what Chriſt did for our behoof, as if it had been our perſonal Act. As the Creditor

ditor Cancels the Bond, lets the Debtor out of Priſon, and gives him every way as Legal a Diſcharge upon the *Sureties* payment of the debt, as he could have done upon his Perſonal Payments.

Next, I ſhall take notice of *Pen's* Scriptures and Arguments.

As for *Exod.* 23. 1. *Prov.* 17. 15. one anſwer will ſerve both. God does not, nor allowes he Man to juſtifie the wicked, *In ſenſu compoſito*, as we ſay, whilſt he is ſuch; nor does God juſtifie the wicked, in juſtifying thoſe to whom Righteouſneſs is imputed, for by that imputation, they are firſt made Righteous, and then Juſtified, or Legally declared to be Righteous: So that unleſs you will deny, that the Act of one Perſon may by contract, or Act of Law, become the Act of another, as was above explained, there's no weight in your allegations. As for *Ezek.* 18. 20. *The ſon ſhall not bear the iniquity of his Father.*

Anſw. Exod. 34. 7. One of God's names is *Viſiting the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the children*, &c. Thus then we collect, that this place ſignifies Gods Perpetual and Immutable right, which to us ſeems to be equitable, in regard of the near Conjunction between Parent and Child, (the Child being but the Parent multiplied.) That in *Ezekiel*, imports Gods gracious Receſſion from his right, becauſe of their more than ordinary audacity, in charging his wayes with

with inequality, *verſe* 25. *verſe* 3. he tells them they ſhould not have occaſion any more to uſe that Proverb, *verſe* 2. the meaning whereof, was *verſe* 19. *The Son bears the iniquity of his Father*, which implies they had had occaſion to uſe it. See *Joſh.* 22. 17. 2 *Sam.* 21. 9, 14. Inſtances of the *Jews* Children bearing the *Iniquity* of their Fathers.

But ſuppoſe that were Gods ſtanding Rule, yet he might in Soveraignty relax his Law, ſo far as to admit of Chriſt, a *ſurety*, inſtead of the Malefactors: and that he hath done, I have proved before.

As for all the reſt, they deſign to prove, we are juſtified by an Inherent, and ſo not by an Imputed Righteouſneſs. The chief, I anſwered before on the head of Juſtification: The reſt are obvious.

Arg. 1. *God cannot Juſtifie what is oppoſite to his pure Nature.*

Anſw. Nor does God juſtifie what is oppoſite to his pure Nature, in juſtifying a Perſon in himſelf impure, upon the Righteouſneſs of another, imputed to him. For ſuppoſing the right of Soveraignty veſted in God, to admit of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, for our perſonal Righteouſneſs, and an intimate Conjunction between Chriſt and us, as one in Nature, and myſtically by Faith, when God juſtifies a Perſon for imputed Righteouſneſs; he juſtifies one as truly (though not in the ſame manner) Righteous,

as if he had been perſonally Righteous.

Arg. 2. *If a man were juſtified by innocency before the Fall, then ſo muſt he be juſtified after it.*

Anſw. We deny the Conſequence, becauſe man having broken the Covenant made with him, God was at his free choice how he would deal with him, (and that God did not think fit to juſtifie Man by a perſonal Innocency or Righteouſneſs, I ſhall prove under the 4*th.* Head of *Errours*) which I preſume P*en* underſtands; for otherwiſe, we are ſince the Fall, juſtified by Innocency, or a perfect Righteouſneſs, as before it, we ſhould have been, only the manner of Communication is different; the one by a Phyſical, the other by a Legal Act or Operation.

Arg. 3. *Sin came not by Imputation, but actual Tranſgreſſion.*

Anſw. The ſin of *Adam* was made his poſterities, *Rom.* 5. 12, 14. by Imputation: *Adam* was a Common Root to Mankind by nature, but a Common Perſon by Divine Conſtitution, in that poſitive Precept and Threat, *Gen.* 2. 17. and the Promiſe therein included, in caſe of Obedience; whence as if he had ſtood, we had all ſtood in him; ſo he falling, we all fell, or *ſinned in him*, as the Apoſtles phraſe is, *Ro.* 5. 12. And then thence the Apoſtle argues, *That as by one maus diſobedience many were made Sinners, ſo by the Obedience of one ſhall many be made Righteous*, Rom. 5. 19.

Arg. 4. *A man cannot be ſaid to be actually Sinful,*

ful, and Imputatively Righteous: He may as well be ſaid to be actually Damned, and Imputatively Saved.

Anſw. Why not, as well as to ſay, a man is actually poor, not worth a Groat: but imputatively Rich, as having by his Surety, paid his debt of thouſands; or to ſay, the nine men throughout a mutinous Army, are actually guilty, and yet imputatively Innocent, when the tenth man is admitted to ſuſtain the puniſhment due to the reſt. Yet there's not the like reaſon to ſay, a man is actually Damned, and imputatively Saved; no more then to ſay, a man is actually dead, and imputatively alive: for *Imputation* is an act of Law, and makes only a relative, not a real change, as from being condemned to be juſtified, not from being dead to be alive.

W. P's Conſequences, are ſome the ſame with his Arguments, as 1, 2, 3, 6. and ſo anſwered already, and the other three are co-incident upon the matter; and the ſum of them is, that if we be juſtified by imputed Righteouſneſs, there is no need of Inherent Righteouſneſs.

Anſw. There is no need of Inherent Righteouſneſs for Juſtification, but yet there is need of it as to other ends, as to make us meet for Heaven, *Col.* 1.12. The different uſe or need of imputed and perſonal Righteouſneſs, may be expreſſed by this Similitude; Legitimation gives a right in law to our Parents eſtate.

The uſe of reaſon, gives a natural capacity of

injoying it. Imputed Righteouſneſs, gives us a Title to the Heavenly Inheritance. Inherent, gives us a fitneſs for the enjoying of it, (it lying in communion with God;) without likeneſs of diſpoſition, there can be no liking of each other.

Errour 4.

That our Good Works (as they are wrought in the Spirit) are a Meritorious (or deſerving) Cauſe of our juſtification. Geo. Whitehead's Voice of Wiſdom *p.* 19. *Printed* 1659. *The Arguments I urge againſt this Errour, are Three.*

Arg. 1. Our good works fall ſhort of the rule of Juſtification, which is the whole Law. *Rom.* 8. 3, *What the Law could not do, in that it was weak, through the fleſh, God ſending his own Son,* &c. The ſum of the Verſe is, that Chriſt was ſent to fulfill the Law for our Juſtification, which we could not do our ſelves, through our corruption, which makes us as averſe, ſo impotent, to Obedience of the Law.

Arg. 2. That we ſhould be juſtified by our good Works, is inconſiſtent with the profeſſed end of God, in the way of our juſtification; which is, that *whoſoever Glorieth, may Glory in the* Lord, *verſe* 31. which Affirmative implies the Negative, ſpoken

of

of on another account, *verſe* 29. *That no Fleſh may Glory in his preſence.* But if we be Juſtified by our good Works, all glorying is not taken away from us: as appears by *Rom.* 3.27. *Where is boaſting then? it is excluded: By what Law? of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* I mean (and ſo doth the Apoſtle) ſuch glorying or boaſting, as the creature is capable of. The Apoſtle tells us indeed, that if *Abraham were juſtified by Works he hath whereof to Glory, but not before God,* Rom. 4. 2. I ſuppoſe, partly becauſe all his ſtrength, (and ſo proportionably any of ours, ſo juſtified) to do thoſe Works, was originally from God (which conſideration is ſuggeſted to check our boaſting, either of Gifts or Graces;) *What haſt thou that thou didſt not receive? now if thou didſt receive it, why doſt thou glory, as if thou hadſt not received it?* 1 Cor. 4. 7. And partly becauſe we have an immediate dependance upon God in our operations. *John* 15. 5. *Without me ye can do nothing* χωρὶς ἐμοῦ, *Seorſim a me,* ſeparate or apart from me, relating to that myſtical Union between Chriſt and his people, whereby their dependance upon him, in all the good they do, is as near and intimate, as that of the Branches upon the Vine, by vertue of their natural Union, in the bearing any Fruit. So the 4 *verſe* ſtates the Compariſon, *As the branch cannot bear Fruit of it ſelf, except it abide in the Vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me.*

3. There is no natural Equivalency between our

Our good Works, and a reward, as there ſeems to be between our Evil Works, and puniſhment, though the Law had expreſſed no penalty.

What boaſting then you will aſk is the creature capable of, and hath he ground for, in juſtification by his own good Works or Righteouſneſs? I anſwer, That there comes nothing, as the reaſon or Meritorious Cauſe of the reward promiſed, between the promiſe of reward to our good Works, and the performance of it; but the goodneſs of our works, or their conformity to the rule, the Law of God. The truth of this will appear, if we compare the Tenour of the Covenant of Works, and Grace, *Gal.* 3. That no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God is evident; *For the juſt ſhall live by Faith, and the Law is not of Faith; but the man that doth them* [i. e. the many things contained in the Law] *ſhall live in them*, verſe 11, 12. 'Tis evident to any attentive Reader, that a compariſon is here made between the two Covenants in point of Juſtification: and their difference lies in this, that in the one, the doer of the Law lives in or by it; but the juſt [*Evangellically*] lives by Faith, not by Faith as a Work (for, conſidered as ſuch, Faith being oppoſed to the deeds of the Law, is oppoſed to, and excludes it ſelf) but Faith is metonymically put for its object, Chriſt cloſed with for juſtification, or Righteouſneſs of Chriſt made ours by Faith, called therefore a

Righteouſ-

Righteouſneſs through the Faith of Chriſt, the Righteouſneſs which is of God by Faith, (viz. in reſpect of the actual Collation or beſtowing of it, not of the Proviſion or Preparation of it, for that is before Faith) *Phil.* 3. 9. And becauſe God deſigns to take away glorying in Juſtification, Faith in God through the *Meſſias*, is called a *Walking humbly with God*, Micah. 6. 8. That it does relate to the Law of Faith, and but only by conſequence, if at all, not directly to the Law of Providence or Submiſſion to afflictions, I am induced to believe upon theſe two grounds:

1. Becauſe otherwiſe God returns no anſwer (which he ſeems plainly to deſign) to the Query, what the Lord will be pleaſed with, or, what ſatisfaction ſhall be given him for *Iſraels* ſin, which is the ſum of the Queſtions, *verſ.* 7. *Will the Lord be pleaſed with thouſands of Rams, or with ten thouſands of Rivers of Oyl? Shall I give my firſt-born for my Tranſgreſſion, the fruit of my Body for the ſin of my Soul?* But underſtanding it thus, there is a plain Anſwer, *viz.* I do not expect any Righteouſneſs of thy gift, but of thy acceptance: or thus, I ſhall not be pleaſed with any Righteouſneſs which thou bringeſt, unleſs it be what I have firſt beſtowed on thee by Faith.

2. The pride of mans heart makes him as loath to accept of a Righteouſneſs freely offered him, as to accept of the puniſhment of his iniquity juſtly inflicted. It makes him as loath to part with the priviledges he had in the Old Covenant

nant, as he that hath set up for himself some time, is to turn an Apprentice: and therefore, 'tis as true an act of Humility, to accept of Gods Righteousnes, as of his Chastisements for Sin.

Arg. 3. If Righteousnes were by the Law (*i. e.* by out personal Obedience to it) then Christ died in vain; they are the Apostles own words, *Gal.* 2. 21. which we may make a perfect Hypothetical Syllogisme, by adding the Minor. But Christ died not in vain, and the Conclusion, therefore Righteousnes comes not by the Law.

Sequela. *Gratis immerito,* without sufficient Cause.

The reason of the Consequence in the Major which the Apostle affords us, is, because the end of Christs death was to provide us a Righteousnes, to be tendred to Gods acceptance, and which (supposing the Covenant of Grace) he neither would, nor could refuse: But if we have Righteousnes sufficient for the end of Righteousnes, Justification; the Righteousnes provided by Christ, comes a day after the Fair, (as we say) too late to bestead us. Christ's end in his Death, was to do that for us (in point of Justification) which we could not do for our selves, (as may well be inferred from the place touched at above, *Rom.* 8. 3, 4.)

The

The Scriptures they alledge, are;

Arg. 1. James 2. 24. *A man is juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only.*

Anſw. If we take Juſtification in a proper ſenſe, for the Abſolution or Acquitting of a Sinner, this place would contradict that in *Rom.* 3. 28. Therefore we conclude, *that a man is juſtified by Faith, and not by the Deeds of the Law.* But there is alway a ſweet conſent though ſometimes a ſeeming diſſent between one Scripture and another.

I therefore diſtinguiſh between Juſtification, as it imports the Abſolution of a ſinner, and as it imports the Approbation of a Beleiver. I alſo diſtinguiſh the word, *Faith*, as it is taken, for a living, or for a dead Faith; that is, for the reality of Faith, or the bare profeſſion. And then I anſwer, that *James* tells us, how a Man is declared or manifeſted to be a juſtified Perſon, (*viz.*) not by a profeſſion of Faith only, but by Works alſo; we are juſtified by Works, as our *Faith is made perfect by works*, Jam. 2. 22. that is declaratively. Faith is declared or evidenced to be perfect, that is, ſincere and true, by Works: As the Tree is not made, but ſhewn to be good by the fruit it bears. And hence 'tis ſaid, that *Faith without Works is dead*, verſe 20. It is ſo, and appears to be ſo, as the Tree that bears not at all. And the ſcope of the place is to convince the Hypo-

pocrites: that ſaid they had Faith, and had one, as appears, *verſ.* 14. and onward. Where-as *Paul* in the other place, *Rom.* 3.28. ſhews us how a Sinner is formally juſtified in the ſight of God, *viz. by a True Faith in Chriſt*, as will appear to him that obſerves, *verſ.* 25,26. where God is ſaid to juſtifie him that believes in Jeſus; *Whom God hath ſet forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood.*

Arg. 2. Rom. 8. 2,4. *The Law of the Spirit of life in Chriſt Jeſus, hath made me free from the Law of Sin and Death. That the Righteouſneſs of the Law may be fullfilled in us, who walk not after the Fleſh but after the Spirit.* From the firſt of theſe *verſes* they conclude, that they are made free Meritoriouſly by the Law of the Spirit in us, from the Law of Sin and Death, becauſe it is the ſame Law of the Spirit of Life that is in Chriſt, and the Saints. From the ſecond they obſerve, that the Righteouſnes of the Law is fulfilled in the Perſons of the Saints.

Anſ. To the ſecond *Verſe*, theirs cannot be the meaning of the Text: For, ſuppoſing a ſtate of freedome from ſin attainable in this life, and that by the Law of ſin and death, is meant only death, the fruit of ſin: yet how can there be any colour for merit of juſtification, when the very priviledge of that ſtate adds to thoſe obligations, by which all the ſervice our capacity will extend to, had been due to God, if we had never ſinned? Two other Senses indeed the words

ſeem

ſeem to learned Men not uncapable of.

1. That the Apoſtle gives a reaſon of the connexion between juſtification and ſanctification, becauſe the ſame Chriſt Jeſus that juſtifies by his blood, ſanctifies by his ſpirit. So *Calvin, &c. in loc.* 2. That they contain the meritorious cauſe of that juſtification, which is evidenced by an holy life, *viz.* the active obedience of Chriſt. So *Beza.* And to this I rather incline.

As for *Ver.* 4. ſome underſtand them to note this end of Chriſts ſending into the World, *viz.* that Gods righteous Laws might not be abſolutely contemned, and ſo given in vain; but might be obſerved (though imperfectly) by believers. Others, of the imputation of Chriſts ſurety, righteouſneſs, *Fide juſſoria juſtitia.* The *Quaker* to be ſure miſtakes; for I ſhall ſhew under the next head, no perfect perſonal righteouſneſs is attainable in this life.

Arg. 3. If our evil works are the meritorious cauſe of our condemnation, then our good works are the meritorious cauſe of our juſtification. But the antecedent is true, therefore the Conſequent. *S. Fiſhers* diſpute at *Sandwich.*

The conſequence he proves from that Rule in Logick, *Contraria contrariorum ratio*, of contraries there is a contrary reaſon or conſequence.

Anſ. We deny the conſequence of the major.

1. Becauſe our good, and our evil works, are not perfectly contrary. For our evil works are perfectly evil; for *malum fit ex quilibet defectu.*

Any

Any one defect makes our works evil: but our good works are but imperfectly good. For *Bonum fit ex integris cauſis.* There muſt be a conformity in all reſpects to the Law to make our works good. For that rule on which *Fiſher* grounds his conſequence, holds only of immediate or perfect contraries, not of mediate. And ſo his conſequence is but like this. If cold water will chill a mans body, luke-warm water will ſcald it.

2. Becauſe there is no condignity in our good works, were they perfectly good; There cannot be a proportion between a finite work, and infinite reward. 'Tis true, the Apoſtle ſays, To him that worketh, the reward is reckon'd not of grace but of debt, *Rom.* 4. 4. But it is to be underſtood of a debt, *Ex pacto gratiæ, non ex operis dignitate*, due by promiſe, not by any merit preceding the promiſe.

Arg. 4. Rom. 2. 13. Not the hearers of the Law are juſt before God, but the doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified. *Pen. p.* 26.

Anſ. The words give the reaſon of their periſhing, who had the Law, (*viz*) the *Jews*, becauſe God cannot juſtifie any on the terms of the old Covenant, that do not perfectly fulfill it; which the *Jews* were far enough from being able to do, or indeed from indeavouring it. They pleaſed themſelves in their priviledges, and external acts of worſhip (for which hearing is put by a Synechdoche) as equivalent in merit to a perfect legal righteouſneſs.

Error 5.

Error 5.

That a ſtate of freedome from ſin, is attainable in this Life.

AGainſt this Errour, I urge two Arguments: 1. If no meer Man ever attained to any ſuch ſtate, then it is not attainable. But no meer Man ever did, *&c.*

The conſequence carries great probability of truth. As for the Minor, that no man ever did attain a ſtate of perfection, we may prove by the inſtances of the eminently holy Perſons in the Scripture, who in all likelihood would have attained it, had it been attainable. I know the *Quakers* do give inſtances of meer men in Scripture, that were perfect: but their miſtake lies in the different uſe of that word (as we ſhall ſee by and by.)

Arg. 2. If there be a continual need and uſe of Faith and Repentance in this life, then a ſtate of freedome from ſin is not attainable in this life. But there is a continual need and uſe of Faith, and repentance in this life; Therefore a ſtate of freedom from ſin is not attainable in this life. The Conſequence is evident; What need can we have of repentance for ſin, that have no ſin to repent of? or of Faith in Chriſt for pardon and power againſt ſin, who is already free from what contracts guilt and defilement? That there is continual

tinual uſe of Faith (and there's the like reaſon of repentance) appears from 1 *Cor.* 13. *ult.* Now abide Faith, Hope, and Charity, theſe three, but the greateſt of theſe is Charity. See *p.* 33.

By Charity, ἀγάπη, we are to underſtand love to God as well as to our Neighbour, as is evident by *Ver.* 3. between which, and Faith, and hope, the Apoſtle ſtates the compariſon in reſpect of their duration; that when the two former ſhall ceaſe, the latter ſhall abide. Charity, or love, ſuits our future perfect, as well as our preſent imperfect ſtate; but Faith and hope ſuit only our preſent and imperfect ſtate.

The *Quakers* Arguments are drawn,

1. From the word perfect. *Phil.* 3. 15. and elſe where applied to Saints on Earth.

Anſ. The word *perfect* is ſometimes uſed abſolutely, 1 *Cor.* 13. 10. oppoſed to what is in part, and ſometimes comparativly, *Phil.* 3. 15. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: Yet *Ver.* 12. he ſays, Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect. He denies in one *Verſe* what he affirms in the other, and ſo contradicts himſelf, if the word *perfect* be in both places underſtood in the ſame ſence. But 'tis evident, that in the 15. *ver.* perfect is not properly taken, for he exhorts to be minded as he was: *Following after the Reſurrection of the Dead*, Verſe 11. That is, that ſtate of holineſs, which the Saints ſhall be inveſted with at the reſurrection (call'd the reſurrection of the dead metony-

metonymically) which will be in a proper ſence perfect; and in a word, to preſs after perfection, from a lively ſence of their own imperfection.

2. From the Exhortations to preſs after perfection, *Math.* 5. 48. *Be ye therefore perfect.*

Anſw. Such commands are the meaſure of our duty, not of our attainments: I meane in this life. In the life to come indeed we ſhall be like God, in this life we are children that bear ſmall reſemblance to their Parent. See 1 *Joh.* 3. 2. That which is now our Rule, ſhall then be our reward.

3. 1 Joh. 3. 9. *Whoſoever is born of God, does not commit Sin.*

Anſw. 1. We may interpret it, that as he is born of God, he does not ſin. Every Child of God is *mixta perſona*, (as our Law ſayes of the King in another ſence) conſiſts of an old and new Nature; and ſo his new nature is the *principium quo*, the Principle from which he acts graciouſly; and the old nature, the Principle from which he acts ſinfully. As mortal or immortal, lyable or not lyable to Death, is truly affirmed of the ſame Man, in reſpect of the diverſe pars of his Nature, Body, and Soul.

2. It may intend the manner of ſinning, So the 8. *verſe* ſeems to limit it. *He that committeth Sin is of the Devil, for the Devil ſinneth from the beginning.* The compariſon is not between the act ſimply, for then it ſhould have been ſaid only, *for the Devil ſinneth*; *but from the beginning*, implies a compariſon between the manner of Mans ſins

and the Devils, in respect of which he is said to be of the Devil, because he imitates his example, who from the Day he began, never ceased to sin, nor ever did one truly good action.

Errour 6.

That Christ enlightens every Man to Salvation.
George Whitehead's *Voice of Wisdom.*

WHere note, that the word *Christ* is a meer blinde, to delude the ignorant, for the *Quakers* denying Christ to be God, they cannot own him for the Author of illumination. The Scriptures I urge against this Tenent, are, *Eph.* 2. 12. *That at that time ye were without Christ, having no hope, &c.* That last clause I intend especially, which must needs be understood, either of the act of hope, or of the ground or warrant of hope; not of the former, for *having no hope*, is a badge of distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile*, as appears by the connexion with the fore-going clause, *Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel*, (that Common-wealth and Church being commensurate;) but if we understand it of the act of hope, the want of that did not distinguish the *Gentile* from the *Jews*; for many of the *Jews* laboured under the same want. Many of them were unbelievers, and so had no hope. (One difference between Faith and Hope being this,

this, that the former looks at the promiſe of the benefit; the latter at the benefit in the promiſe.) *Fides reſpicit verbum rei, ſpes rem verbi. Luther.* We muſt underſtand the phraſe then of having no ground or warrant of hope, and to that interpretation the fore-going clauſe leads us, *Strangers from the Covenants of Promiſes.* And *Gentiles* thereby were diſtinguiſhed from the *Jews*, whoſe the Promiſes are ſaid to be, *Rom.* 9. 4. *viz.* The promiſes of Chriſt and Salvation. From the words thus explained, I argue:

Arg. They that had no promiſes of Chriſt, and Salvation by him, could know of none. But the *Gentiles* for a time had none, therefore they knew of none, and conſequently, had not a Light, or knowledge ſufficient to bring them to Salvation.

The major is evident, every act ſuppoſes an object. I cannot know that which is not. The minor is proved by 1 *Tim.* 3. *laſt*, Where *God manifeſt in the Fleſh*, and as ſuch *preached to the Gentiles*, are made two parts of the Myſtery of godlineſs: and by that pregnant place, the Myſtery of Chriſt, which in other ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men, as it is now revealed to his holy Apoſtles, and Prophets, by the Spirit, that the *Gentiles* ſhould be fellow-heirs, and of the ſame body, and partakers of his Promiſe in Chriſt by the Goſpel, *Eph.* 3. 4, 5, 6. The place may be its own Commenr, it is ſo plain,

2. *Luke* 10. 21. Thou haſt hid theſe things

from the wiſe and prudent, and haſt revealed them unto babes. The Father is ſaid to hide the Object, becauſe he did not inlighten the Subject, *i.e.* To hide the Goſpel, which was then openly and plainly Preached, becauſe he did not inlighten their minds with a ſaving knowledge of it.

2. 1 Cor. 2.14. *The natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are fooliſhneſs to him: neither can we know them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned.*

1. Obſerve, here is an oppoſition between men and men, in reſpect of the knowledge of the things of God. The Spiritual man judges all ſpiritual things, *verſe* 15. but the natural man knows not, nor judges them. Yea, he accounts the Doctrine of the Goſpel fooliſhneſs.

2. The natural man not only does not know them, but cannot, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned, which imporrs a diſpropertion between the object and faculty; (ſuch for inſtance) as between ſence, and a rational object.

Whence the Apoſtle ſpeaks of an underſtanding given to know Chriſt, 1 *John* 5.20. implying, that our old underſtanding will not ſerve to apprehend Chriſt after a ſpiritual, though it may, to apprehend him after a rational manner

The Scriptures which carry any colour for the Quakers *Opinion, of all that I have met with, are theſe.*

1 Joh. 1. 9. *That was the true Light, which light-*

lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.

Anſw. Chriſt being ſpoken of before as the Meſſias, or Saviour, to whom *John* did bear witneſs, *verſe* 7. we muſt therefore underſtand the place, I think not of natural Light, but of ſupernatural; not of the Light of Reaſon, where-with as God, he endues men; but of the Light of the Goſpel, with which, as the Meſſias, he enlightens Men: which light may admit of a double conſideration, according to the uſe of the Word φωτίζω, which ſignifies, 1. To ſhine, or to light; that is, afford light, by which the object is made viſible, whether there be an eye to ſee it, or no; ſo 'tis uſed, *Luk.* 11. 36. 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. 2. 'Tis uſed to inlighten the eye or faculty, *Eph.* 1. 18. *That the eyes of our underſtandings may be inlightned, &c.* If you take it in the former ſence, Chriſt by his powerful Preaching, and glorious Miracles, did not ſhine on every man. Many never heard his Doctrine, nor ſaw his Works. As ſome parts of the World ſee not the Sun, when it ſhins brightly in our Horizon. So that the meaning can be no more than this, that the Goſpel is taught to all comers without exception, by Chriſt and his Miniſters; not that every particular perſon hath the benefit: Many in all ages never heard, (no nor perhaps heard of) the Goſpel. 2. If we take the word in the other ſence, for inlightning the Eyes of the mind, 'tis certain, that many who are lighted (as our phraſe is, when a Candle is carried before us) are not inlightned, but are

like a blind man ſo lighted, that ſees never the better. And then the meaning can be no more than this, that whoſoever are inlightned, are inlightned by him, and anſwers in ſence, to *Jam.* 1. 17. *Every good gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights.* And leſt we may ſeem to impoſe upon the Objector, we will turn to a parallel place, *Pſal.* 145. 14. *The Lord upholdeth all that fall, and raiſeth up all them that be bowed down.* 'Tis evident enough, that however the words ſound, the ſence can be but this, that all that are upheld from falling, or raiſed again after a fall, are in God's debt for the help of his hand.

2ly. *Rom.* 2. 15. The *Gentiles* are ſaid to have the Law in their Hearts. *Whitehead, Voice of Wiſdom.*

Anſw. They are alſo ſaid to be without Law, and are oppoſed to them that had the Law, *verſe* 12. *viz.* of *Moſes, ver.* 17. *Called the Oracles of God*, Chap. 3. 2. and made the Priviledges of the *Jews* above the *Gentiles ver.* 1. in this reſpect, becauſe hereby *Salvation was of the Jews*, John 4. 22. *i. e.* the knowledge of the way of *Salvation*: therefore it cannot be underſtood of a *ſaving Knowledge* without a Contradiction.

2. It is not the Law in their hearts, but the Work of the Law, *viz.* theſe two effects mentioned, *accuſing* and *excuſing*. For though 'tis true, the Gentiles having ſome knowledge of the Law, the Law may be ſaid to be in their

hearts meaning their underſtandings; yet in the Apoſtles uſe of that Phraſe, *Heb.* 8.11. he ſeems to include, if not mainly intend a ſuitable diſpoſition to the Law, or a *delight in the Law after the inner man*, Rom. 7.22. Whereas the *Gentiles* in this ſence, had not the Law in their hearts; For they liked not to retain God in their knowledge, *Rom.* 1. 26. but as he was an unbidden, ſo an unwelcome Gueſt to them; ſo that they could ſcarce forbear to ſay to God, *Depart from us, for we deſire not the Knowledge of thy Wayes*, Job 21. 14.

3*ly.* Rom. 1. 19, *That which may be known of God is Manifeſted in them for God hath ſhewed it unto them*, [*viz.* the Gentiles.]

Anſw. The next verſe ſuggeſts an anſwer, *viz.* that which might be known of God by arguing from the Effects to the Cauſe, from the Creation to the begining of God, and his Eternal Power, the firſt Divine property that appeared in giving Being to all things out of nothing; and the uniform event of this knowledge, is ſaid to be the leaving them without excuſe, not the leading them to Salvation.

4*ly.* Iſa. 49. 6. *I have ſet thee for a Light to the Gentiles, &c.* Spoken of Chriſt.

Anſw. That is but a Prophecy of the Gentiles mercy in the times of Chriſt actual Exhibition in the fleſh, which was not fulfilled till the *Jews* rejection of Chriſt, as appears by *Act.* 13. 46, 47. And the ſame Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. *The*

casting away of them [the Jews] *was the reconciling of the World* (viz.) *the Gentiles*, verse 15.

Errour 7.

The Scriptures are not the Word of God, but only a true Declaration of it; nor are they the only Rule of Faith and Life. G. Whitehead, *Voice of Wisdom*, p. 20. Sam. Fisher, *Quakers Folly*, p. 28.

TO bring any Testimony of Scripture, concerning it self, were *Petitio principii, a begging of the Question*, and were insignificant for their conviction, who deny it's Divine Authority. And to urge Arguments drawn from *the purity of Scriptures Precepts*; *Sureness of Principles of Trust*; *Excellency of Rewards*; *Sublimity of Doctrine*; *Prediction of future Contingents*; *the Secresy and Efficacy of its Operation on the hearts of men*, (being such as no other Writeing can give us a single instance of the like;) *the Miracles* (whereof, multitudes of Adversaries were eye-Witnesses, able and willing to discover the Impostures, (if any had been) *Wrought for the Confirmation of it*: I say, to urge these Arguments, were to launch into an Ocean of Discourse: I shall therefore only give a taste of their Arguments,

ments, and ſo leave their Tenent to the judgment of the underſtanding.

The *Quakers* Arguments will diſcover their meaning, without any Explication of the term.

Arg. Your Scriptures is without: but the Word of God is within, *Rom.* 10. 8. *The Word nigh thee, even in thy Heart*, Fiſher, *p.* 31.

Anſw. 1. Our Scripture is *within* as well as *without*. That Command, *Let the Word of God dwell in you*, Col. 3. 16. is in a degree, obeyed by every Saint. And therefore by this Argument, *Scripture is the Word of God.*

2. That every Scripture, *Rom*, 10. 8. ſpeaks not of the *Light within*, but of *the Scriptures*; for the Apoſtle calls it *The word of Faith which he preached, latter Clauſe of the Verſe*, which he tells us was the Doctrine contained in the Writeings of *Moſes* and the Prophets, *Acts* 26. 22. [where we may obſerve, that the *Quakers* urge the Scriptures for their Tenents againſt us, only as *Argumentum ad hominem*, to confute us by our own Principles, not that they own the Authority of Scripture.]

Arg. 2. *If there was a rule before the Scripture was written, then that is not our rule. But there was a rule before the Scripture.* Fiſhers, Quakers Folly, *&c.* p. 29. *Whitehead*, by way of queſtion to the ſame effect, *What was their rule who ſpake forth the Scriptures?* Voice of Wiſdom. *Queſt.* 4

Anſw.

Anſw. The matter contained now in the Scripture, was alwayes the Rule, before it was committed in Writing, though it was not alwaies in the ſame manner, nor Degree, conveyed, and publiſhed. Since the Goſpel Preached to *Adam*, *Gen.*3.15. There hath not been any addition, *quoad Eſſentiam*, but only *quoad Explicationem*; not in ſubſtance, but in cleafneſs of Diſcovery. In that reſpect, God is ſaid to have ſpoken to the Fathers by the Prophets *at ſundry times*, or (as the *Greek* Reads) *by many parts*, or *piece meal*, πολυμερῶς. *Heb.* 1.1. And the way of conveyance hath been different, *in diverſe manners*. πολυτρόπως. *In the ſame verſe*, (viz.) Viſions, Dreams, *&c.* In oppoſition to both which, God is ſaid to have ſpoken to us by his Son in his Perſon, and Apoſtles, who have left us a clear Comment on the old Teſtament. And we are not now to expect any new Diſcovery of Truth, *Ex parte rei revelatæ vel Objecti*; as to the matter revealed: but only, *Ex parte actus revelandi, vel ſubjecti*, as to the Perſons whom God Inlightens gradually, to diſcern the evidence of what is revealed in Scripture.

Arg. 3. *What was the Gentiles Rule, who had not the Scripture?*

Anſw. 1. So much of the matter contained in the Scriptures, as is written on their Hearts. For the Scriptures give us a Coppy of all that is Written there, with many Additions; a new Object of Faith, God in Chriſt, Old Duties inforced by New Arguments, Love to one another,

ther, preſſed by the example of Chriſts redeeming Love, *John* 3. 34. Sins againſt Light of Nature, (as uncleanneſs) diſſwaded from, by Arguments drawn from union between Chriſt, and our Bodies; Chriſts property in them by Redemption, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 6. 14. to the end.

2. When we affirm the Scriptures to be the only *rule*, we muſt in reaſon be ſuppoſed to intend, to them who have them, not who have them not.

3. We muſt underſtand this point in Conjunction with the former, *the Light within*: and ſo we ſay, That they who have not the Scripture, ſince its Publication, have not any other way, a diſcovery of God ſufficient to lead them to him, and ſo to Salvation; which we intend, when we affirm the Scripture to be the Word of God.

Arg. 4. *What is their Rule who cannot Read the Scriptures? Muſt they be Condemned, who cannot Read them?*

Anſw. 1. The ſame Rule with their's who can, (*viz.*) the Matter contained in the Scriptures, however conveyed, whether by Eye or Ear.

2. They ſhall not be condemned for their natural Incapacity (unleſs accidentally, as their neglect of Learning to Read, that they might be able to Read the Scriptures, is their Sin) but for their unbelief and Diſobedience to the Doctrine of the Scripture, by what means ſoever come to their Knowledge. As

As for that Notion of the *Quakers*, in the Terms of the queſtion, that the Scripture is but a true Declaration of the Word of God [in the Hearts of Believers, as *Whitehead* explains, *p.* 16.] I ſay but this:

Anſw. 1. The Scripture is a Declaration of what ought to be in the Hearts of Believers, and not only of what is. 2. The Pen-men underſtood not all they wrote, 1 *Pet.* 1. 10, 12. And there are *Prophecies* and Hiſtories of things done before the Pen-mens Birth, as well as perſonal Experiences.

Errour 8.

That there is no need of any outward Teaching: Ceaſe from your out-ſide lights, and return to the Light of Chriſt in you, and this Light is not a Chapter without you in a Book. James Naylor, in his Glory of the Lord ſhining out of the North. *p.* 2.

THe only Argument I ſhall urge, is from *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, 13. *He* [*Chriſt*] *gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, for the perfecting of the Saints.* Whence I draw this Argument, If Chriſt hath ſetled Officers in his Church, till it be made perfect in grace, then there is need of outward teaching, during its whole ſtate in this life. But he hath made ſuch ſettle-

ſettlement, *&c.* The Antecedent is evident in the Text before us. The conſequence goes upon a ſuppoſition of what I have before proved.(*viz.*) that no members of the Church arrive to a perfection of grace in this life, and therefore cannot be ſaid at any time not to ſtand in need of teaching.

The Scriptures which the Quakers *urge againſt the need of outward Teaching, are theſe:*

Their firſt Scripture,

Heb. 8. 11. *And they ſhall not teach every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, ſaying, know the Lord.*

Anſw. That place cannot exclude outward teaching, unleſs it could be no means of Knowledge; or unleſs there could be no knowledg of God, but what were of immediate Revelation to the ſubject in which it is found. For, compare this place taken out of *Jer.* 31. 34. with *Iſa.* 2. 3. (ſpeaking of the times of the Goſpel, in which the promiſe before us, was to receive its full accompliſhment) and we finde, that *Out of Zion was to go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jeruſalem, i.e.* The Knowledg of God to be conveyed by Ordinances, for which, *Zion* the Hill whereon, *Jeruſalem* the City wherein, the Temple the Seat of Ordinances ſtood [See *Pſal.* 87, 2. 3. and *Pſal.* 122.] are often put. And the

the fulfilling of it, Christ and his Apostles did frequently teach in *Zion*, or the Temple, and so in *Jerusalem*, Mat. 26. 55. And the great Commission Apostolical, was, *To preach among all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem*, Luke 24. 47. It does not then exclude the teachings of men. But if we compare this part of the verse with the last Clause, *For all shall know me from the least to the greatest*; the meaning is evident, (*viz.*) that God does not hereby exclude, but include the teachings of Men, and promise a greater efficacy to them than formerly; so that the Christians of the New Testament should be able *to leave the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, and to go on to perfection*. (As the Apostle speaks, *Heb.* 6. 1.) *i. e.* not to forget, or unlearn them, but not to stick in them, without further progress; (as for a Scholar to be alwayes learning Grammar, and never proceed to Rhetorick, Logick, *&c.*

Second Scripture is, 1 John 2. 27. *Ye need not that any Man teach you.*

Answ. This is spoken in opposition to any of *the Seducers*, Verse 26. whose teaching the Christians needed not. In which sense the *Colossians* are said to be *compleat in Christ*, Col. 2. 10, 8. In opposition to *Mosaical* Ceremonies, human traditions, or Philosophical Principles, which might pretend to discover some what necessary to salvation, not revealed in the Gospel, or contrary to that Revelation: which interpretation of the text before us, is favoured by the latter clause: *but as*

the

the ſame anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth, and is no lye, 1 *John.* 2. 27.

2. This place will bear another interpretation, (*viz.*,) that they were grown Chriſtians, ſuch as did not altogether depend upon others, but knew ſomewhat themſelves; (having an inward Light, or ſpiritual judgment (called) (metonymically *an anointing.*) That Character, *ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the Truth.* 2 *Tim.* 3. 7. However it agreed to other Chriſtians, did not agree to them: ſo that in the *Quakers* interpretation, there is the fallacy; *a dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum ſimpliciter* (as Logicians ſpeak;) that is, to take thoſe words abſolutely, which are intended in a certain reſpect. And that theirs cannot be the meaning, will appear to any one, that ſhall but remember, that after Chriſts aſcention, when the ſpirit was poured out in moſt plentiful meaſure; (ſo that if at any time on Earth, then might the teachings of Man ſeem needleſs) there was greateſt plenty of Teachers extraordinary, ordinary, (as we finde in the Acts of the Apoſtles.)

Another Branch of the *Quakers* Errour, as to Ordinances, refers to *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, of which they affirm, that *they ceaſe upon the appearance of Chriſt within.* A. P's. *ſeveral Papers*, p. 19. *Farnworth's Diſcovery of Faith*, p. 11.

Againſt

Againſt which Errour, I oppoſe two Arguments; one for both Ordinances, the other for Baptiſm in particular.

Arg. 1. If Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are ſtanding Ordinances, [or ſuch as we are obliged to uſe, during this Life] then they do not ceaſe upon the appearance of Chriſt within, [or are not made uſeleſs or unneceſſary by any degree of attainments in this life.] But the former is true, therefore the latter.

That they are ſtanding Ordinances, appears, becauſe no formal repeal can be produced, either *in terminis*, or by any due conſequence from Scripture; nor yet any vertual repeal, as in Laws made for a time, and at the expiration thereof, of courſe, ceaſing to oblige,

That then they do not ceaſe as to our need of them, follows evidently, becauſe it is not to be ſuppoſed conſiſtent with Chriſt's wiſdome, to continue an obligation upon us, to the uſe of a means, when the end is obtained already.

All that can be ſaid with any colour, is, That they are of perpetual obligation, *till the appearance of Chriſt within*; that is, a full appearance, or ſtate of perfection. But we having proved before, that there is no ſuch ſtate attainable in this life; then if thoſe Ordinances oblige, till we be arrived at perfection, they oblige, and ſo are of uſe, during term of life.

Arg. 2. If Baptiſm be a Foundation-Doctrine, (as I may call it) then it is of uſe during this life. That

That it is ſuch, appears by *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. where the Apoſtle calls *the Doctrine of Baptiſm, a Foundation*; by which phraſe of the Apoſtle, the knowledg of the uſe and intendment of that Ordinance by thoſe who had or were to receive it, ſeems to be meant. The conſequence is good, If it be an Ordinance, all Chriſtians are to underſtand and improve, then they muſt receive it. Being baptized into Chriſts death, cannot be an argument to induce the unbaptized to a mortification of ſin, which the Apoſtle urges upon the baptized, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4.

If it be ſaid, that the Apoſtle exhorts the *Hebrews to leave this Principle or Foundation of Chriſtian Doctrine, verſ.* 1. I anſwer, that by leaving it, the Apoſtle cannot mean relinquiſhing the practice thereof. For then by force of the ſame phraſe, applyed to Faith and Repentance, &c. theſe Graces muſt alſo be left, (the contrary whereto I have before proved) but the Apoſtle explains himſelf, that they ſhould not ſo ſtick in the Foundation, as not to proceed to the ſuperſtructure, or higheſt points of Chriſtian Doctrine. I could never meet with any thing, that looked like an Argument, for their opinion, but that place, which ſpeaks of *ſhewing forth the Lord's Death*, in the Supper, *till he come*, which they interpret, *till he come in the ſpirit*, 1 Cor. 11. 26.

Anſw. So Chriſt was come already to the believing *Corinthians*. The Apoſtle ſpeaking of them and himſelf, ſays, *We have received not the*

Spirit of the World, but the Spirit which is of God, 1 Eph. *chap.* 2. *v.* 12. And yet that hindred not the Apoſtles encouragement and direction in their uſe of the Lord's Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26, 28.

Errour 9.

That there is no Reſurrection from the Dead. Robert Turner *in a Letter of his to the* Baptiſts; *and* George Whitehead, *in his late* Anſwer *to* W. Burnet; *and* George Fox, Jun. *in his Works bound up together.*

THe Scripture is plentiful in aſſerting the Reſurrection. I ſhall only ſingle out one Argument to evince it.

Arg. If the Bodies that have done Good or Evil, muſt receive their reward accordingly, then the ſame Bodies that die muſt riſe again. But the Antecedent is true, therefore alſo the Conſequent.

That the Bodies that have done Good or Evil, muſt receive their reward accordingly (which Propoſition is the antecedent) is evident by 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. And then the Conſequence is firm, becauſe thoſe Bodies receive not their Reward, till the Univerſal Judgment, and then they cannot receive it (having been once diſſolved) unleſs they riſe again.

For the further proof of antecedent and consequent, I shall first explain the Terms of Christ's Argument to prove the Resurrection from the Dead, which to ordinary Readers may seem inconsequent, and then shew how the Argument is deduced.

The place is *Mat.* 22. 31, 32. As *touching the Resurrection from the Dead, have ye not Read that which was spoken unto you by God; Saying, I am the God of* Abraham, *and the God of* Isaac, *and the God of* Jacob: *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.* And 'tis added, *Luke* 20.38. *For all live unto him.*

To be a God to Abraham, notes, a Covenant-Relation, and so an Obligation to confer all the Blessings of the Covenant; among which, Eternal Glory is, though the last, yet not the least. *Not the God of the Dead,* that might be meant either of them who are dead, *simply,* or of them that are so dead, as that they shall never return to life: Not in the former sence, for God proclaimed himself the God of *Abraham,* &c. long after he was dead, therefore in the latter sence: *But of the living,* that is of them whom God intends to restore to Life, or whose Bodies live *Potentially*; not only of them, whose Souls live *Actually: For all live to him,* that Clause seems to import a reason of that Denomination *living,* given to those that were truly *dead,* viz. *That God calls the things that are not, as if they were,* Rom. 4. 19. Because of his Omnipotency, and Immutability of his Counsel.

Concerning the Scope of theſe Words, there are different apprehenſions, ſome conceive that Chriſt hereby proves the Immortality of the Soul, (which the *Sadduces* denied, as appears by *Acts* 23. 8. For if there be no Soul of a Spiritual Nature in man, it muſt needs be Mortal, (as his body) and by conſequence only, the Reſurrection of the body.

The *Sadduces* denying the Reſurrection of the body, becauſe they denyed the Immortality of the Soul, (as theſe Interpreters conceive;) others, that Chriſt intends only to prove the Reſurrection of the body, ſo *Calvin*. Others, that Chriſt intends both directly, ſo *Beza Diodati*. And hence the Argument of our Lord as ſomewhat differently framed. Either thus;

They whoſe God, God is, ſhall riſe from the Dead. God is Abraham's, Iſaac's, *and* Jacob's *God.*

Therefore they (and upon the ſame ground, all other Believers) ſhall riſe again. The conſequence he proves, becauſe God is the God only of the Living, and ſo ſeeing they live in Soul, they ſhall live in Body too. Or elſe thus;

They whoſe God, God is after death, ſhall riſe again. But God is the God of *Abraham*, &c. (and conſequently of all Believers) after death; therefore *Abraham*, &c. ſhall riſe again.

The reaſon of the conſequence is, becauſe otherwiſe God were not the God of *Abraham's*, *Iſaac's*, and *Jacob's* (and ſo other Believers) perſons,

perſons, but of their Souls only; whereas to be the God of their Perſons, is to be under a Covenant to give them (as other things, ſo) Glory; and ſo their bodies muſt be glorified, as well as their Souls (their Perſons being conſtituted or made up of thoſe two Eſſential Parts:) or the Argument may be framed more plainly thus, in the ſence of Chriſt's Words:

If God be under a Promiſe to glorifie the Perſons of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, then their Bodies muſt riſe again; But God is under ſuch a Promiſe, therefore, their Bodies muſt riſe again.

The antecedent is evident by the Explication of the Terms above. The conſequence depends upon a double ground, partly God's Fidelity in making good his Promiſe, and partly becauſe *Abraham's*, &c. body is uncapable of the benefit of the promiſe of Glory, made to it, without a Reſurrection. And the Argument thus phraſed, ſuggeſts a fuller anſwer to the Exception made againſt it, as firſt laid down, *(viz.) That God might be the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, after death, if there were no Reſurrection; becauſe their Souls live, in reſpect of which, God were their God.*

Anſw. Firſt, God is ſaid to be *the God of Abraham*, that is, of his Perſon, for his Soul is but part of his Perſon, not the whole; and to be the God of the Perſon includes the glorifying of the whole Perſon, not only of a part.

2. God were not fully *Abraham*'s God, or did not fully make good his Promiſe, if he glorified one part of *Abraham* and not another.

3. Nor were the Promiſe to glorifie *Abraham*'s Soul, made good, without glorifying his body too: for the Happineſs of the Soul is not perfect without the body, it's dear and beloved Companion; (the Soul having a ſtrong deſire and Inclination to a re-union to the Body (as the Schools not without good ground determine) *Vid. Calvin. Harm. Evang.* in Mat. 22. 31, 32. Luk. 20, 38.

4. If whole *Abraham* be not the correlate in the Covenant, or party Covenanted with, how is any thing (as in the Text a Reſurrection) attributed to him, in reſpect of a part of him? There cannot be a ground for a Limitation in reſpect of a part, (as here, that *Abraham* ſhould riſe as to his body) unleſs the Whole be in Being [either Actually as to his Soul, or Potentially as to his Body, in reſpect of the Decree and Covenant of God] *Vid. Vedel. Rationale Theologicum*, l. 2. c. 6.

To apply the ſum of Chriſt's Argument, for the proof of the antecedent, and conſequent of my Argument for the Reſurrection, which was this:

If the Bodies that have done Good or Evil, muſt receive their Reward accordingly, then the ſame bodies muſt riſe again, &c.

That

That the Bodies that have done good muſt receive their reward, is evident, becauſe God is under a *promiſe* to reward them. And riſe again they muſt, becauſe elſe God's Promiſe to the Bodies muſt either not be made good at all, or not to the ſame Body to which it was made (which is contrary to the whole Scope of Chriſt's Argument.)

If any ſhall ſay, that Chriſt's Argument and my Application of it, proves but the Reſurrection of the good, and their Reward in their Bodies. I anſwer two things:

1. That the *Sadducees* and *Quakers* Propoſition being, *That there is no Reſurrection from the Dead*, which is an univerſal Negative, therefore a parcular Affirmative, that *ſome* [the good] *ſhall riſe again*, is contradictory thereto, and overthrows their Ngative; and therefore to prove that all ſhall riſe again, is not ſtrictly needful: for that were *Oppoſitio contraria*, not *Contraria dictoria* (as the *Logicians* ſpeak:) Yet *Ex abundanti*, I anſwer,

2. Chriſt's Argument ſuggeſts another to us, for the proof of the Reſurrection of the Bad. For by the ſame Reaſon, that the Good muſt riſe, becauſe of God's Promiſe to Glorifie their Bodies; the wicked alſo muſt riſe, becauſe of God's threatning to torment their Bodies. For God is not more bound to fulfill his Promiſes, than his threats, when they have ſome ſtamp or character upon them; (as an Oath for inſtance,

Heb: 3: 18 *Chap*: 7: 21:) whereby they may be known to be *ſigna beneplaciti*, diſcoveries of God's ſecret will or decree. Which limitation I add, becauſe 'tis evident, that ſome promiſes and threats have a tacite condition, upon which, though not the act of Divine will, yet the things willed depend, as 1 *Sam*. 2. 30. *Jonah* 3.4, 10. and in the non-performance of them God does not croſs, but comply with his ſecret will.

Turner's Arguments againſt the Reſurrection, are:

Arg. From *Eccleſ*. 3. 19, 20, 21. Whence he concludes, the fleſhly Bodies of Men riſe not again: for if the fleſhly Bodies of Men riſe again, and not the fleſh of Beaſts; then Men's Bodies have a preheminence over a Beaſts Body: and to affirm the Bodies of Men ſhall riſe again, were to give *Solomon* the lie.

Anſw. Men are ſaid to be Beaſts κατὰ τί not ſimply, but in a certain reſpect, (*viz*.) in reſpect of the Mortality of the Body, which being compoſed of the ſame Materials with bruit Beaſts, is as lyable to a diſſolution. In reſpect of the Immortality of Man's Soul, and the Reſurrection of his Body, *He hath preheminence above a Beaſt*. As for *Verſe* 21. if they be the Atheiſts words, perſonated by *Solomon*, they note the Reaſon of his Opinion, becauſe the difference between Man and Beaſt, as to their future ſtate, is not viſible, as their agreement in their diſſolution is. If they be *Solomon*'s own words, he cannot

not be ſuppoſed to mean any more, than that the different diſpoſal of the ſpirits of Man and Beaſt, is not viſible to the eye of ſence, and but dimly to the eye of reaſon and faith; and ſo may be an occaſion of the Atheiſts conceit, that that difference in their future ſtate, is but talk, and uncertain conjecture. For *Chap.* 12.7. *Solomon* tells us, *That the ſpirit of Man returns to God that gave it*, (*viz.* to be diſpoſed of, as Juſtice, or Mercy ſhall ſee meet.)

Arg. 2. From *Job* 7. 8. *The Eye of him that hath ſeen me, ſhall ſee me no more.* But if all riſe again, then the Eye that hath ſeen him, may ſee him again; which Opinion giveth *Job* the lie.

Anſw. The meaning of *Job* can be, but that the Eye that had ſeen him, ſhould after his death ſee him no more *in ſtatu quo*, not with ſuch worldly comforts about him, as now he had; *Verſe* 10. he inſtances, in *a return to his Houſe.* They that had ſeen him an Inhabitant in the Land of *Uz*, ſhould never ſee him there again in that capacity. *Verſ.* 7. *He ſays his Eye ſhould ſee no more good*; compare that paſſage with this in hand, and they amount to this, that *Job* ſhould after death no more enjoy the accommodations of this life, and therefore no Eye could be witneſs of any ſuch injoyment. That *Job* did not intend a denial of the Reſurrection of his Body, unleſs we will make *Job* give himſelf the lie, is evident by *Chap.* 19. 26, 27. *And though after my Skin, worms deſtroy this body, yet in my Fleſh ſhall I ſee God,*

whom

whom I ſhall ſee for my ſelf, and mine Eyes ſhall behold, and not another, though my Reins be conſumed within me. Of which place, he that would ſee a full explication, let him read the Learned *Caryl Comm. on Job.* All that I ſhall infer from the ſumme of the words, diſcernable by an ordinary judgment, is, that if *Job* had the ſame body after the Reſurrection, that he had before, then he was as viſible after, as before it.

Arg. 3. From 1 *Cor.* 15. 50. *Fleſh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*; then not the body of Man (ſays the *Quaker*) for that is fleſh, and in it is blood.

Anſw. The latter Clauſe of this Verſe explains the former, *Neither doth Corruption inherit Incorruption*; where the Apoſtle gives us to underſtand, that a Corruptible Body ſhall not inherit a ſtate of Immortality [the adjunct being put for the ſubject, in both words:] And the *Quakers* interpretation croſſes the whole drift of the Apoſtle in a great part of the Chapter, which is to ſhew that the ſame Body ſhall riſe, but with ſo different qualities, that it ſhall be as unlike to what it was before, as the ſtanding Corn, to the Seed put into the Earth; or as one Star is to another in brightneſs and luſtre, *Verſ.* 37, 38, 41. And the Apoſtle enumerates thoſe qualities, *Verſ.* 42, 43, 44. The ſum whereof is, that that Body which was before *mortal, i. e.* liable to death, *natural, i. e* ſupported by food, reſt, *&c.* *diſhonoured* by being uſed as an Inſtrument of ſin; and by weakneſſes,

neſſes, blemiſhes, the fruits of ſin, ſhall become *immortal*, *i. e.* not liable to death; *ſpiritual*, *i. e.* not needing nor uſing its former props; *glorious*, neither ſubject to ſin or the puniſhment of it.

I might have been much larger on theſe points; but I know great Books find few buyers, and fewer *Readers*, and therefore I reſolved not to exceed Six Sheets. I wiſh what I have done, may prove profitable. If my Anſwers ſeem not ſo clear as the Objections (which I hope I need not fear, unleſs in the point of the Trinity, that being a myſtery ſo high, that it rebates the ſharpeſt edg of human underſtanding) I deſire the *Reader* to ponder upon this grave ſaying of a Learned Man; *It is eaſier to oppoſe, than to defend the Chriſtian Religion; for it having ſomething in it above the capacity of Man's underſtanding, 'tis no hard matter by Reaſon to oppoſe ſuch a Religion.* Villeroy, in his Counceller of State.

FINIS.

AN ADVERTISEMENT.

ONe of W. Pen's *Arguments against the Trinity, I had almoſt omitted (it being out of its proper Place, in his Book,* viz. *that in* pag. 10.) *If the God-head ſubſiſt in Three diſtinct Manners or Forms, then one of them cannot be a compleat Subſiſtence without the other two, and ſo parts, and ſomething finite would be in God; or if infinite, then three diſtinct infinite Subſiſtences, and by conſequence Three diſtinct Gods.*

Anſw. *Not to quarrel at the Impropriety of* Pen's *Phraſe, nor at the Coincidence, in effect of this with his Third Argument. I*

anſwer, by denying the conſequence. For as every Perſon is compleat, In eſſe quiddi-tivo, *pea* Eſſentiam; i.e. *is truly God by having the Divine Nature: So is every Perſon compleat.* In eſſe Perſonali per Subſiſtentiam, (*as the Schools ſpeak;*) i.e. *is a compleat Subſiſtent or Perſon, by his proper manner of ſubſiſting. And I wonder he ſhould not ſee, that his Argument may be retorted upon him thus. If the God-head be in Three Manners or Forms, then the God-head in the one manner, muſt needs be a Compleat Subſiſtent, and diſtinct from the God-head in the other two Manners: or more plainly thus; If the ſame God-head be in the Father, Son, and Spirit, that they muſt needs be diſtinct one from another, and any one compleat without the other two. God the Father cannot be God the Son, nor can God the Son be God the Father: Though both Father and Son are one God. For the Perſons are formally conſtituted by their Relative Properties, and ſo the God-head conſidered with its Three Relative Properties, admits of a Threefold diſtinction from it ſelf abſolutely conſidered.*

If

An Advertiſment.

If any ſhall wonder at the Diſtance of Time, between the Date of the Epiſtle and Publication, he may pleaſe to know, that the Whole Book (except the Advertiſement) was finiſhed before the Epiſtle; but by reaſon of ſome intervening Accidents (not needful, nor altogether convenient to be mentioned) could not get through the Preſs till now.